arXiv:1112.5537v3 [nucl-th] 27 Jun 2012

arXiv: 1112.5537v3[nucl-th]

Nonperturbative NN scattering in $^3S_1$–$^3D_1$ channels of EFT($\not\pi$)

Ji-Feng Yang[1,2]
[1] Department of Physics, East China Normal University, Shanghai 200241, China
[2] Kavli Institute for Theoretical Physics China,
Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing 100190, China

The closed-form solutions of NN scattering matrices for the coupled channels $^3S_1$–$^3D_1$ in EFT($\not\pi$) with the potentials truncated at order $\mathcal{O}(Q^4_{(\not\pi)})$ are presented in details with the nonperturbative divergences parametrized in a general manner. The stringent constraints imposed by the closed-form of the T matrices are analyzed with the help of the underlying theory perspective. The realization or implementation of subtractions and the manifestation of EFT power counting rules in nonperturbative regimes are shown to differ from perturbative cases and give rise to the concept of scenario that is intrinsic of nonperturbative renormalization of EFT. Then a number of scenarios of the EFT description of NN scattering are compared with PSA data in details employing the effective range expansion. The problems and rationalities of various scenarios for describing realistic NN scattering with large scattering lengths are presented, showing that it is favorable to proceed in a scenario with conventional EFT couplings and reasonable prescriptions of renormalization. The natural appearance of and the roles played by the fine-tuning in terms of EFT couplings are also demonstrated in several places and interpreted in the underlying theory perspective. In addition, some of the approaches appearing in recent literature are also addressed in the perspective adopted here. Many technical details are also given for completeness of our presentation.

I. INTRODUCTION

In the past two decades, the NN systems and nuclear forces have been intensively studied using effective field theory method since Weinberg's proposal[1, 2] and the pioneering works in Refs.[3, 4], which provides nuclear physics with field theoretical foundations in terms of symmetries that characterize low-energy QCD. For more about the exciting achievements and progresses in this area, we refer to the review articles, e.g., [5–9]. However, it is theoretically fair to say that a few stumbling blocks are still in the way towards claiming the complete establishment of the field theoretical foundations for nuclear physics. The renormalization of NN scattering is one of the intriguing issues and has attracted many authors' attention. For a comprehensive account of the literature on this issue, we refer to the review articles in Refs.[5–9].

Earlier impetus to this issue was given by the discussions of the problems of Weinberg's power counting and the treatments of the renormalization of NN sector in Refs.[10–12]. Since then, a number of approaches have been put forward, ameliorated and discussed[14–18, 20–66] [*], accompanied with some controversies and debates. As summarized in Ref.[9], in short of complete agreements, there are now two main choices in renormalizing the NN sector: (1) One insists on standard subtraction algorithm of infinities through expanding around some leading component of the NN potential that is first treated nonperturbatively; (2) The other insists on the nonperturbative treatment of the full potential up to the order of truncation, with the renormalization implemented following the method advocated by Lepage[67].

As noted by many authors[7–9, 46], the problem is originated from the nonperturbative nature of the low-energy NN scattering: The conventional algorithm for subtraction is only established within perturbative contexts, not guaranteed to work beyond perturbative contexts at all. Of course, the ultimate goals and basic principles of renormalization, which is now best encoded in the philosophy underlying effective field theories, should not vary with contexts. However, its concrete implementation could be context-dependent, it is reasonable to anticipate that not all the patterns, contents and scenarios of renormalization could have been fully embodied, or manifested themselves or even foreseeable in the standard perturbative algorithms. Therefore, the roles played by EFT power counting rules, the implementation of subtractions and the associated wisdoms should all be reexamined, ameliorated and adapted in order to work out a fully coherent field theoretical framework or algorithm in nonperturbative regimes. The present status about the NN sector in EFT approach implies that we are still in short of a satisfactory framework in nonperturbative contexts, but not the failure of the effective field theory approach. In this regard, the choices made in literature could all be understood as various degrees of efforts or steps towards the full realization of renormalization in nonperturbative contexts or regimes, and Lepage's proposal could be interpreted as the first conceptual shift in this direction[67].

---

[*] We apologize for being unable to give a comprehensive list of all the literature on this issue.

Some of the concerns mentioned above have already been touched upon somehow in our previous works[46, 47, 54, 60, 61, 63]. In this report, we wish to present a study of the NN scattering in the coupled channels ${}^3S_1{-}{}^3D_1$ with a more coherent account of the concerns raised above within the realm of EFT($\not\pi$) with the potential truncated at order $\mathcal{O}(p^4)$, the extension of the results to higher orders and other channels is a straightforward matter. (Recently, contact corrections to NN potentials are constructed beyond static approximation beginning from next-to-next-to-leading order, they are important for studying chiral extrapolation, but not consequential for phenomenology[68].) It is well known that the renormalization of EFT($\not\pi$) has been settled in conventional means with impressive achievements (see, *e.g.*, [5, 6, 31]). Here it is revisited due to the availability of rigorous solutions (i.e., closed-form T matrices) to the Lippmann-Schwinger (LS) equations and the feasibility of a general parametrization of renormalization prescription, which will provide useful insights into the issue of renormalization in nonperturbative regimes. That is, the closed-form T matrices serve as theoretical laboratories for exploring the crucial notions and contents of renormalization that are intrinsic of nonperturbative regimes and not foreseeable in perturbative regimes. We must stress that our analysis below does not defy perturbative like approaches at all, but highlights that some nonperturbative components must be incorporated one way or the other. We should also note that the formulation and results presented below are also applicable in many non-relativistic systems such as cold atoms and molecules that are dominated by short range interactions.

As far as phenomenology is concerned, the contact potential solutions will reproduce the effective range theory. However, the functional dependence of the closed-form T matrices upon EFT couplings and renormalization prescriptions are indeed informative of nonperturbative renormalization, a source of insights that is elusive in the formulation of effective range theory. Another point that is noteworthy is that an EFT upper scale is actually physical within the effective field theories framework as it corresponds to the real threshold in EFT expansion, which should NOT be vacuously taken as a regulator scale or cutoff to be removed in the standard renormalization algorithm of perturbation theory where no finite upper scale could be reasonably posited. For example, in EFT($\not\pi$), the upper scale should be of the order of pion mass $\Lambda_{(\not\pi)} \sim m_\pi$. For pionfull EFT without heavy mesons, the upper scale is naturally set by the scale heavy mesons, say, the mass of ρ meson, $\Lambda_{(\pi)} \sim m_\rho$. The same arguments apply to other low-energy effective field theories that are supposed to work below specific thresholds.

This report is organized as follows: Section II is devoted to the detailed formulation of the problem and the rigorous solutions to Lippmann-Schwinger equations (LSE) for ${}^3S_1{-}{}^3D_1$. The renormalization of the integrals involved is discussed and parametrized in nonperturbative regimes. In sect. III we explore the properties of the closed-form T matrices that show why perturbative renormalization algorithm and the associated notions cease to apply directly and what must be done in a nonperturbative realization or implementation of renormalization. Also presented are the scenario notion of EFT that arises in nonperturbative regimes and the nonperturbative running couplings in simpler cases. Section IV will be devoted to a comprehensive analysis of the phenomenological behaviors of the closed-form T matrices embodied in various EFT scenarios. The problems and rationalities for some important scenarios are analyzed with the help of effective range expansion and fine-tuning, with the constraints implied by fine-tunings being explored and interpreted. Some discussions and a summary of our report will be given in sect. V.

II. RIGOROUS SOLUTIONS IN EFT($\not\pi$)

A. Preliminary Setups

Since the NN system scatter in coupled channels only for the triplet states, let us start with a standard parametrization for the on-shell partial wave S matrix for the triplet states with total angular momentum j:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{S} &\equiv \begin{pmatrix} S_{j-1,j-1}(p) & S_{j-1,j+1}(p) \\ S_{j+1,j-1}(p) & S_{j+1,j+1}(p) \end{pmatrix}, \\
S_{j\pm1,j\pm1}(p) &\equiv [\cos 2\epsilon_j(p)] \exp[2i\delta^{1j}_{j\pm1}(p)], \\
S_{j\pm1,j\mp1}(p) &\equiv i[\sin 2\epsilon_j(p)] \exp[i(\delta^{1j}_{j-1}(p) + \delta^{1j}_{j+1}(p))],
\end{aligned} \qquad (1)$$

where $\delta^{1j}_{j\pm1}(p)$ and $\epsilon_j(p)$ denote the phase shifts and the mixing angle, p denotes the on-shell momentum for a nucleon. Under this parametrization, the on-shell T matrix introduced as $\mathbf{S}=\mathbf{I}-\frac{iMp}{2\pi}\mathbf{T}$ with M being the nucleon mass. According to Weinberg, the nucleon-nucleon potential could be systematically constructed or calculated using χPT[1] through counting the powers in terms of p^2/Λ^2 or m_π^2/Λ^2 with Λ being the upper scale for the EFT under consideration ($\Lambda\sim 0.5$ GeV). Then the off-shell T matrices for the coupled channels could be found through the solving LSE's,

$$\mathbf{T}(q',q;E)=\mathbf{V}(q',q)+\int_k \mathbf{V}(q',k)G_0(k;E)\mathbf{T}(k,q;E),\quad G_0(k;E)\equiv\frac{1}{E^+-k^2/M},\tag{2}$$

where $E^+\equiv E+i\epsilon$ with E being the center of mass energy and the bold-faced letters mean that they are 2×2 matrices in the partial wave representation:

$$\mathbf{V}=\begin{pmatrix} V_{j-1,j-1} & V_{j-1,j+1} \\ V_{j+1,j-1} & V_{j+1,j+1}\end{pmatrix}=\mathbf{V}^T.\tag{3}$$

Note that matrix multiplication is understood in the convolution terms of the above LSE's, namely, in $\mathbf{V}G_0\mathbf{T}$.

As mentioned in the introduction, we wish to work with EFT($\not{\pi}$) where potentials become contact ones that allow us to transform the integral equations into algebraic ones following Ref.[14] to investigate some intriguing issues from nonperturbative perspectives, unlike in many literature where KSW expansion[10, 11] is used, see, e.g., Ref.[31] and the review articles in Refs.[5, 6]. Below we will present all the necessary notations and details to make our presentations self-contained. First we introduce the following notations for the ${}^3S_1$–${}^3D_1$ channels:

$$\mathbf{V}=\begin{pmatrix} V_{ss} & V_{sd} \\ V_{ds} & V_{dd}\end{pmatrix},\quad \mathbf{T}=\begin{pmatrix} T_{ss} & T_{sd} \\ T_{ds} & T_{dd}\end{pmatrix},\tag{4}$$

with the meanings of the subscripts being self-evident. Then the four individual LSE's read:

$$T_{ss}=V_{ss}+V_{ss}G_0T_{ss}+V_{sd}G_0T_{ds},\tag{5}$$
$$T_{sd}=V_{sd}+V_{ss}G_0T_{sd}+V_{sd}G_0T_{dd},\tag{6}$$
$$T_{ds}=V_{ds}+V_{ds}G_0T_{ss}+V_{dd}G_0T_{ds},\tag{7}$$
$$T_{dd}=V_{dd}+V_{ds}G_0T_{sd}+V_{dd}G_0T_{dd}.\tag{8}$$

The formal solutions to these coupled LSE's are easy to find:

$$T_{ss}=(1-\tilde{V}_{ss}G_0)^{-1}\tilde{V}_{ss},\tag{9}$$
$$T_{sd}=(1-\tilde{V}_{ss}G_0)^{-1}V_{sd}(1-G_0V_{dd})^{-1}=(1-V_{ss}G_0)^{-1}V_{sd}(1-G_0\tilde{V}_{dd})^{-1},\tag{10}$$
$$T_{ds}=(1-\tilde{V}_{dd}G_0)^{-1}V_{ds}(1-G_0V_{ss})^{-1}=(1-V_{dd}G_0)^{-1}V_{ds}(1-G_0\tilde{V}_{ss})^{-1},\tag{11}$$
$$T_{dd}=(1-\tilde{V}_{dd}G_0)^{-1}\tilde{V}_{dd},\tag{12}$$

with

$$\tilde{V}_{ss}\equiv V_{ss}+V_{sd}G_0(1-V_{dd}G_0)^{-1}V_{ds},\tag{13}$$
$$\tilde{V}_{dd}\equiv V_{dd}+V_{ds}G_0(1-V_{ss}G_0)^{-1}V_{sd}.\tag{14}$$

These formal expressions, which contain UV divergences, must be so renormalized through proper means that the nonperturbative or closed-form solutions be preserved. Using the trick introduced in Ref.[14], we could obtain closed-form and hence rigorous solutions in case of contact potentials, where the divergent or renormalized parameters could be readily isolated and generally parametrized[47].

B. Algebraic LSE's

To this end, we introduce the following matrices for V_{xy} and $T_{xy}(x,y=s,d)$:

$$V_{xy}(q,q')=U^T(q^2)\lambda_{xy}U(q'^2),\tag{15}$$
$$T_{xy}(q,q';E)=U^T(q^2)\tau_{xy}(E)U(q'^2),\tag{16}$$

with $U^T(q^2) \equiv (1, q^2, q^4, \cdots)$ being a row vector (n dimensional) in terms of external momentum q, λ and τ are the corresponding $n \times n$ matrices furnished by the contact couplings $C_{\dots}$[†] at a given order of potential truncation in EFT framework. Note that some of the elements of the matrices $[\lambda_{xy}]$ vanish at any given order due to truncation. This is an important structure that proves to be consequential, see Sect. III A.

For example, at truncation order $\mathcal{O}(Q^4_{(\not\pi)})$ or $\Delta = 4$, we have $U^T(q^2) = (1, q^2, q^4)$, and the following 3×3 matrices,

$$\lambda_{ss} \equiv \begin{pmatrix} C_{0;ss} & C_{2;ss} & C_{4;ss} \\ C_{2;ss} & \tilde{C}_{4;ss} & 0 \\ C_{4;ss} & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \lambda_{sd} \equiv \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ C_{2;sd} & \tilde{C}_{4;sd} & 0 \\ C_{4;sd} & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} = \lambda^T_{ds}, \quad \lambda_{dd} \equiv \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & C_{4;dd} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}. \tag{17}$$

The lowest order cases ($\Delta = 0, 2$) are much simpler. Evidently, the contact couplings $[C_{\dots}]$ scale like $C_{n;\dots}/C_0 \sim \Lambda^{-n}_{(\not\pi)}$ in the naive EFT power counting scheme, with $\Lambda_{(\not\pi)}$ being upper scale for EFT($\not\pi$).

Using such notations, the Eqs.(5,6,7,8) can be reduced to the following algebraic equations[14, 47],

$$\tau_{ss} = \lambda_{ss} + \lambda_{ss}\mathcal{I}(E)\tau_{ss} + \lambda_{sd}\mathcal{I}(E)\tau_{ds}, \tag{18}$$

$$\tau_{sd} = \lambda_{sd} + \lambda_{sd}\mathcal{I}(E)\tau_{dd} + \lambda_{ss}\mathcal{I}(E)\tau_{sd}, \tag{19}$$

$$\tau_{ds} = \lambda_{ds} + \lambda_{ds}\mathcal{I}(E)\tau_{ss} + \lambda_{dd}\mathcal{I}(E)\tau_{ds}, \tag{20}$$

$$\tau_{dd} = \lambda_{dd} + \lambda_{dd}\mathcal{I}(E)\tau_{dd} + \lambda_{ds}\mathcal{I}(E)\tau_{sd}, \tag{21}$$

with

$$\mathcal{I}(E) \equiv \int \frac{d^3k}{(2\pi)^3} \frac{U(k^2)U^T(k^2)}{E - k^2/M + i\epsilon}, \tag{22}$$

where the energy dependence of the τ's are self-evident and henceforth omitted. The matrix $\mathcal{I}(E)$ is furnished with the integrals arising from the convolution with G_0, prescription-dependent at this stage. With such kind of algebraic parametrization, all the ill defined integrals can be isolated and parametrized as elements of the matrix $\mathcal{I}(E)$ which could be defined in any prescription, see below. This yields great convenience for discussing the important issues associated with power counting schemes and renormalization prescriptions. Moreover, the solutions to the algebraic equations are easy to obtain, which are structurally the same as the T matrices given in Eqs.(5,6,7,8):

$$\tau_{ss} = (1 - \tilde{\lambda}_{ss}\mathcal{I}(E))^{-1}\tilde{\lambda}_{ss}, \tag{23}$$

$$\tau_{sd} = (1 - \tilde{\lambda}_{ss}\mathcal{I}(E))^{-1}\lambda_{sd}(1 - \mathcal{I}(E)\lambda_{dd})^{-1} = (1 - \lambda_{ss}\mathcal{I}(E))^{-1}\lambda_{sd}(1 - \mathcal{I}(E)\tilde{\lambda}_{dd})^{-1}, \tag{24}$$

$$\tau_{ds} = (1 - \tilde{\lambda}_{dd}\mathcal{I}(E))^{-1}\lambda_{ds}(1 - \mathcal{I}(E)\lambda_{ss})^{-1} = (1 - \lambda_{dd}\mathcal{I}(E))^{-1}\lambda_{ds}(1 - \mathcal{I}(E)\tilde{\lambda}_{ss})^{-1}, \tag{25}$$

$$\tau_{dd} = (1 - \tilde{\lambda}_{dd}\mathcal{I}(E))^{-1}\tilde{\lambda}_{dd}, \tag{26}$$

with

$$\tilde{\lambda}_{ss} \equiv \lambda_{ss} + \lambda_{sd}\mathcal{I}(E)(1 - \lambda_{dd}\mathcal{I}(E))^{-1}\lambda_{ds}; \tag{27}$$

$$\tilde{\lambda}_{dd} \equiv \lambda_{dd} + \lambda_{ds}\mathcal{I}(E)(1 - \lambda_{ss}\mathcal{I}(E))^{-1}\lambda_{sd}. \tag{28}$$

To obtain the T matrices, one only needs to perform the matrix multiplication $U^T\tau U$.

As a matter of fact, we could put the above results into more succinct form if we introduce the following 'super' matrix notations for τ_{xy}, λ_{xy}:

$$\underline{\lambda} \equiv \begin{pmatrix} \lambda_{ss} & \lambda_{sd} \\ \lambda_{ds} & \lambda_{dd} \end{pmatrix}, \quad \underline{\tau} \equiv \begin{pmatrix} \tau_{ss} & \tau_{sd} \\ \tau_{ds} & \tau_{dd} \end{pmatrix}, \quad \underline{\mathcal{I}}(E) \equiv \begin{pmatrix} \mathcal{I}(E) & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathcal{I}(E) \end{pmatrix}, \tag{29}$$

then the coupled LSE's could be put into the following one line short equation,

$$\underline{\tau} = \underline{\lambda} + \underline{\lambda}\underline{\mathcal{I}}(E)\underline{\tau}, \tag{30}$$

[†] In this report, it is tacitly assumed that these couplings are energy-independent as energy dependence in potentials can be removed using unitary transformations[23].

whose solution reads,

$$\underline{\tau} = \left(1 - \underline{\lambda}\underline{\mathcal{I}}(E)\right)^{-1}\underline{\lambda}. \tag{31}$$

We have verified that Eq.(31) do reproduce the solutions given in Eqs.(23,24,25, 26) using the formulae given in Appendix A.

C. Parametrization of the matrix $\mathcal{I}(E)$

The renormalization of the T matrices for NN scattering within EFT($\not\pi$) now boils down to the renormalization of the matrix $\mathcal{I}(E)$ to be realized or implemented within nonperturbative context. To proceed, we will need a general parametrization of this matrix, of which a generic element formally reads

$$\mathcal{I}_n \equiv \int \frac{d^3k}{(2\pi)^3}\frac{k^{2n}}{E - k^2/M}. \tag{32}$$

Then, such an integral can be parametrized as follows:

$$\mathcal{I}_n = -\mathcal{I}_0 p^{2n} + \sum_{l=1}^{n} J_{2l+1}p^{2(n-l)}, \quad \mathcal{I}_0 \equiv J_0 + i\frac{M}{4\pi}p, \quad p \equiv \sqrt{ME}, \tag{33}$$

with $J_{\dots}$ being prescription-dependent parameters (usually constants) at this stage. For example, in the hard cutoff (Λ) scheme, we have

$$J_0 = \frac{M}{2\pi^2}\left(\Lambda - \frac{p}{2}\ln\frac{\Lambda + p}{\Lambda - p}\right), \quad J_{2l+1} = -\frac{M}{2\pi^2}\frac{\Lambda^{2l+1}}{2l+1}. \tag{34}$$

In dimensional regularization, such integral reads,

$$J_0 = 0, \quad J_{2l+1} = 0. \tag{35}$$

In PDS[10, 11, 26, 27], we have

$$J_0 = \frac{M}{4\pi}\mu, \quad J_{2l+1} = 0. \tag{36}$$

Actually, there is a simple and natural method for computing and parametrizing the integral in Eq.(32) basing on an elaborate implementation of the effective field theory strategy[69–72]: First we differentiate it with respect to the energy or the on-shell momentum squared (parameters external to the loop integral) for sufficient times to arrive at a convergent integral and carry out the integration. Then we integrate back indefinitely, arriving at a definite expression in terms of energy or on-shell momentum plus an ambiguous polynomial as a general parametrization of prescriptions to be specified or fixed later. Specifically, this is to solve the following differential equations

$$\left(\partial_{p^2}\right)^{n+1}\mathcal{I}_n = -i\frac{\Gamma\left(n+\frac{3}{2}\right)M}{4\pi\sqrt{\pi}}p^{-1}, \tag{37}$$

the solution to this equation takes exactly the form given in Eq.(33) with J_0 and $[J_{2m+1}, m > 0]$ being the arbitrary constants arising from the indefinite integration with respect to p^2. Of course, the best way to understand the values of $J_{\dots}$ is to view them as decoupling effects of the underlying structures[47, 69–72], or as a general parametrization of such effects.

With the parametrization of Eq.(32), the matrix $\mathcal{I}(E)$ could generically be written in the following succinct form

$$\mathcal{I}(E) = -\mathcal{I}_0 U(p^2)U^T(p^2) + \sum_{l=1}^{\Delta} J_{2l+1}\Delta U_l \tag{38}$$

after introducing the following symmetric matrices

$$\Delta U_1 = \frac{1}{p^2}\int_0^{p^2} dt \frac{d[U(t)U^T(t)]}{dt}, \tag{39}$$

$$\Delta U_{l+1} = \frac{1}{p^2}\int_0^{p^2} dt \frac{d[\Delta U_l(t)]}{dt}, \quad l \geq 2. \tag{40}$$

The concrete expressions for ΔU_l at order $\Delta = 4$ are listed in Appendix B.

D. Closed-form T matrices

As mentioned above, the closed-form T matrices could be readily obtained by sandwiching the τ's in Eq.(23,24,25,26) or (31) between the row and column vectors $U^T(q^2)$ and $U(q'^2)$. Putting q and q' on-shell, one could readily get the on-shell matrices. After some algebra, we could find following the closed-form on-shell T matrices at order $\Delta = 4$:

$$\frac{1}{T_{ss}(p)} = \mathcal{I}_0 + \frac{\mathcal{N}_0 + \mathcal{I}_0\mathcal{N}_1 p^4}{\mathcal{D}_0 + \mathcal{I}_0\mathcal{D}_1 p^4}, \tag{41}$$

$$\frac{1}{T_{sd}(p)} = \frac{\mathcal{N}_0 + \mathcal{I}_0\left(\mathcal{D}_0 + \mathcal{N}_1 p^4\right) + \mathcal{I}_0^2\mathcal{D}_1 p^4}{\mathcal{D}_{sd}p^2} = \frac{1}{T_{ds}(p)}, \tag{42}$$

$$\frac{1}{T_{dd}(p)} = \mathcal{I}_0 + \frac{\mathcal{N}_0 + \mathcal{I}_0\mathcal{D}_0}{\left(\mathcal{N}_1 + \mathcal{I}_0\mathcal{D}_1\right)p^4}, \tag{43}$$

$$\mathcal{N}_1\mathcal{D}_0 = \mathcal{D}_{sd}^2 + \mathcal{D}_1\mathcal{N}_0. \tag{44}$$

We note that all the parameters $[\mathcal{N}..., \mathcal{D}...]$ are real polynomials in terms of couplings $[C...]$, $[J_{2m+1}, m > 0]$ and on-shell momentum p, which are all independent of the complex parameter $\mathcal{I}_0$, for detailed expressions, see Appendix C.

As a matter of fact, the functional forms of the T matrices in terms of $[\mathcal{N}..., \mathcal{D}...]$ and $\mathcal{I}_0$ given above hold at any truncation order. To see this, let us start with the examination of the unitarity relation in terms of the matrix $\mathbf{T}$ furnished with the above closed-form on-shell T matrices. Inverting the matrix $\mathbf{T}$, we find

$$\mathbf{T}^{-1} = \begin{pmatrix} \mathcal{I}_0 + \mathcal{N}_1/\mathcal{D}_1, & -\mathcal{D}_{sd}/(\mathcal{D}_1 p^2) \\ -\mathcal{D}_{sd}/(\mathcal{D}_1 p^2), & \mathcal{I}_0 + \mathcal{D}_0/(\mathcal{D}_1 p^4) \end{pmatrix}. \tag{45}$$

With this inverse form, it is ready to see that the on-shell unitarity is fulfilled,

$$\mathbf{T}^{-1} - (\mathbf{T}^{-1})^\dagger = \mathbf{T}^{-1} - (\mathbf{T}^\dagger)^{-1} = \frac{iMp}{2\pi}\mathbf{I}, \tag{46}$$

with $\mathbf{I}$ denoting the 2×2 unit matrix. As a matter of fact, this on-shell unitarity can be rigorously shown to hold at any given order of truncation for the coupled channels, for details, C.f. Appendix D. Using this unitarity relation as a starting point, we could also establish that the inverse form of the on-shell super matrix $\mathbf{T}$ must take the following form *at any given order of potential truncation*,

$$\mathbf{T}^{-1} = \mathcal{I}_0\mathbf{I} + \begin{pmatrix} \tilde{\mathcal{N}}_{ss}/\tilde{\mathcal{D}}_{ss}, & -\tilde{\mathcal{N}}_{sd}/\tilde{\mathcal{D}}_{sd} \\ -\tilde{\mathcal{N}}_{sd}/\tilde{\mathcal{D}}_{sd}, & \tilde{\mathcal{N}}_{dd}/\tilde{\mathcal{D}}_{dd} \end{pmatrix}, \tag{47}$$

and $[\tilde{\mathcal{N}}..., \tilde{\mathcal{D}}...]$ must be $\mathcal{I}_0$-independent polynomials in terms of $[C...]$, $[J_n, n > 0]$ and p^2, again, see Appendix D for a detailed proof of this corollary.

Interestingly, Eq.(47) also implies that the functional dependence of the T_{ss}, T_{dd} upon $\mathcal{I}_0$ and $[\mathcal{N}..., \mathcal{D}...]$ as exhibited in Eqs.(41,42,43) holds at any truncation order. To see this point, it suffices to invert the $\mathbf{T}^{-1}$

in (47), then one finds

$$
\begin{aligned}
\frac{1}{T_{ss}} &= \mathcal{I}_0 + \frac{\widetilde{\mathcal{N}}_0 + \mathcal{I}_0 \widetilde{\mathcal{N}}_1}{\widetilde{\mathcal{D}}_0 + \mathcal{I}_0 \widetilde{\mathcal{D}}_1}, & (48)\\
\frac{1}{T_{sd}} &= \frac{\widetilde{\mathcal{N}}_0 + \mathcal{I}_0(\widetilde{\mathcal{N}}_1 + \mathcal{I}_0 \widetilde{\mathcal{D}}_0) + \mathcal{I}_0^2 \widetilde{\mathcal{D}}_1}{\widetilde{\mathcal{D}}_{sd}}, & (49)\\
\frac{1}{T_{dd}} &= \mathcal{I}_0 + \frac{\widetilde{\mathcal{N}}_0 + \mathcal{I}_0 \widetilde{\mathcal{D}}_0}{\widetilde{\mathcal{N}}_1 + \mathcal{I}_0 \widetilde{\mathcal{D}}_1}, & (50)\\
&\widetilde{\mathcal{N}}_0 \equiv \tilde{\mathcal{N}}_{ss}\tilde{\mathcal{N}}_{dd}\tilde{\mathcal{D}}_{sd}^2 - \tilde{\mathcal{N}}_{sd}^2\tilde{\mathcal{D}}_{ss}\tilde{\mathcal{D}}_{dd},\ \widetilde{\mathcal{N}}_1 \equiv \tilde{\mathcal{N}}_{ss}\tilde{\mathcal{D}}_{dd}\tilde{\mathcal{D}}_{sd}^2, &\\
&\widetilde{\mathcal{D}}_0 \equiv \tilde{\mathcal{N}}_{dd}\tilde{\mathcal{D}}_{ss}\tilde{\mathcal{D}}_{sd}^2,\ \widetilde{\mathcal{D}}_1 \equiv \tilde{\mathcal{D}}_{dd}\tilde{\mathcal{D}}_{ss}\tilde{\mathcal{D}}_{sd}^2,\ \widetilde{\mathcal{D}}_{sd} \equiv \tilde{\mathcal{N}}_{sd}\tilde{\mathcal{D}}_{sd}\tilde{\mathcal{D}}_{ss}\tilde{\mathcal{D}}_{dd} & (51)
\end{aligned}
$$

which are equivalent to Eqs.(41,42,43). Then, (44) follows immediately as a byproduct:

$$\frac{\widetilde{\mathcal{D}}_{sd}^2 + \widetilde{\mathcal{N}}_0 \widetilde{\mathcal{D}}_1}{\widetilde{\mathcal{N}}_1 \widetilde{\mathcal{D}}_0} = 1. \tag{52}$$

We note in passing that a small part of the foregoing contents have been given in cursory presentations in our previous works[54, 60, 61, 63]. Equipped with the closed-form T matrices with their prescription dependence being parametrized in a general manner, we could better explore the issues around the renormalization of the nonperturbative T matrices. Of course, one could also explore more physical issues with such closed-form T matrices. We will consider some of them in the following sections.

III. CLOSED-FORM AND RENORMALIZATION

In this section, we explore the closed-form T matrices obtained above to gain useful insights into the issue of renormalization of $\mathrm{EFT}(\not\pi)$ in nonperturbative regime.

A. Isolation of $\mathcal{I}_0$ and intrinsic mismatch

In Eq.(45) or (47), there is a very crucial structure worth emphasis: The complex parameter $\mathcal{I}_0$ is always 'isolated' from the couplings $[C...]$ and the parameters $[J_{2m+1}, m > 0]$ in the inverse $\mathbf{T^{-1}}$. This is also true in an uncoupled channel for L-wave

$$T_L^{-1} = \frac{1}{T_L} = \mathcal{I}_0 + \frac{N_L}{D_L} p^{-2L}, \tag{53}$$

with N_L, D_L being polynomials in terms of $[C...]$, $[J_{2m+1}, m > 0]$ and p^2, for a proof in the ${}^1S_0$ channel we refer to [47]. The cases of the uncoupled D channels can be verified using the above T matrices through letting $V_{sd} = 0$, so $\mathcal{D}_{sd} = 0,\ T_{sd} = T_{ds} = 0$, and

$$\frac{1}{T_D} = \mathcal{I}_0 + \frac{\mathcal{N}_0}{\mathcal{N}_1} p^{-4} = \mathcal{I}_0 + \frac{N_D}{D_D} p^{-4}.$$

This crucial structure has been addressed in our previous works[47, 54, 60, 61]. To make our presentation here self-contained, we further elaborate on the structure as below: (1) The 'isolation' of $\mathcal{I}_0$ is universally true in any channel and at any order, making $\mathcal{I}_0$ unique in $\mathrm{EFT}(\not\pi)$; (2) The functional shape of the closed-form T matrices with respect to the on-shell momentum p is physical, hence prescription independent. Consequently, the 'isolation' position makes J_0 become RG invariant in the closed-form T matrices, except the trivial cases of the S-wave T matrices at the lowest order $T_S^{-1} = J_0 + i\frac{Mp}{4\pi} + C_{0;S}^{-1}$ that leads to the KSW running of $C_{0;S}$[10]; (3) The uniqueness and RG invariance of J_0 also imply that J_0 could only depend on physical scales, namely, the upper scale $\Lambda_{(\not\pi)}$ and the typical scale $Q_{(\not\pi)}$ in $\mathrm{EFT}(\not\pi)$:

$$J_0 = \frac{M}{4\pi} f_0(\Lambda_{(\not\pi)}, Q_{(\not\pi)}). \tag{54}$$

Thus, J_0 is no longer an ordinary renormalization scale, but a fundamental quantity to be determined through physical inputs in EFT($\not{\pi}$).

Conventionally, UV divergences appear in the local part of the vertices with tree level couplings, and local counterterms can be constructed from such vertices or couplings to remove such divergences. In EFT($\not{\pi}$), this means the divergences in the matrix $\mathcal{I}(E)$ must pair up or 'match' with the contact couplings so that counterterms could be constructed from these couplings. Unfortunately, such matching fails in the closed-form T matrices, the first example is the parameter $\mathcal{I}_0$ or J_0 noted above.

Actually, beyond the first two orders of potential truncation (i.e., $\Delta \geq 4$), more and more parameters in $\mathcal{I}(E)$ become 'unmatched' in the closed-form T matrices. For example, at order $\Delta = 4$, this could be simply seen from the following relations between some coefficients in the p^2 expansion in the factors $\mathcal{D}_0, \mathcal{D}_1, \mathcal{N}_0$ and $\mathcal{N}_1$ (see Appendix C):

$$\delta_{0;4}J_3 = -\delta_{1;3} = -J_3^2\nu_{0;3} = \nu_{1;2}J_3. \tag{55}$$

Since any ratios constructed using such coefficients, say $\delta_{1;3}/\delta_{0;4}$ or $\nu_{0;3}/\nu_{1;2}$, should be physical or RG invariant, so $J_3 = -\delta_{1;3}/\delta_{0;4} = -\nu_{0;3}/\nu_{1;2}$ is also constrained to be physical or RG invariant. In other words, J_3 is also 'unmatched' with EFT couplings in the closed-form T matrices. One could also verify this using our previous result about the ${}^1S_0$ channel where $D_{{}^1S_0;3}/N_{{}^1S_0;2} = -J_3$, with $[D_{{}^1S_0;3}, N_{{}^1S_0;2}]$ being the coefficients of the highest p^2-power terms in $[D_{{}^1S_0}, N_{{}^1S_0}]$ respectively[47].

A more transparent way to look at this issue is to invert the reduced algebraic LSE in an uncoupled channel[61]. It suffices to demonstrate it with the ${}^1S_0$ channel at a given order of truncation:

$$\tau^{-1}_{{}^1S_0} = \lambda^{-1}_{{}^1S_0} - \mathcal{I}(E). \tag{56}$$

As no element of $\mathcal{I}(E)$ is zero while all the elements in the upper left triangle block of $\lambda^{-1}_{{}^1S_0}$ vanish due to truncation, there is an intrinsic mismatch between $\mathcal{I}(E)$ and $\lambda^{-1}_{{}^1S_0}$, i.e., a mismatch between the ill-definedness in $\mathcal{I}(E)$ and the available 'pools' for counterterms from $\lambda^{-1}_{{}^1S_0}$ within nonperturbative regime. Moreover, a further mismatch exists even between the nonzero entries of $\mathcal{I}(E)$ and $\lambda^{-1}_{{}^1S_0}$: the p dependence differ. Letting $\lambda^{-1}_{{}^1S_0}$ develop p dependence to match the p^2 monomials in $\mathcal{I}(E)$ would lead to nonlocal time dependence in $\lambda_{{}^1S_0}$ or the local potential $V_{{}^1S_0 0}$ and in turn ruin the EFT power counting. Putting more couplings into λ to make all elements nonzero would simply break the EFT truncation rules and could not help to remove all the mismatches[61]. Therefore, conventional counterterms could not succeed in nonperturbative regime and subtractions must be implemented otherwise, and the direct link or connection between EFT power counting (for potential truncation) and nonperturbative renormalization is lost. Later on, we will analyze this issue from the underlying theory perspective that will yield further insights.

B. Nonperturbative 'finiteness'

Obviously, the closed-form T matrices impose stringent constraints that preclude renormalization from being realized in the standard perturbative pattern. Some of the prescription parameters must be treated as physical parameters (or RG invariants) rather than ordinary running parameters and should be determined through appropriate boundary conditions or inputs of data. Then there is a concern about the feasibility of imposing such boundary conditions as there seems to be infinitely many divergences in LSE.

In this connection, we note that at a given order of EFT truncation, the number of the prescription-dependent parameters $[J...]$ appearing in the closed-form T matrices is finite, or the rank of $\mathcal{I}(E)$ is finite[54]. Amusingly, this 'finiteness' is in fact guaranteed by the truncation whose presence becomes a virtue at this point. Thus, we are led to a novel notion of 'finiteness' in nonperturbative renormalization: There are finitely many nonperturbative divergences to be dealt with. All the divergences involved in the iteration series can be simply factorized into a finite number of 'irreducible' divergences that furnish a finite dimensional matrix $\mathcal{I}(E)$. It is this 'finiteness' that makes the nonperturbative renormalization of T matrices feasible in principle and hence extends the notion of renormalizability somehow in nonperturbative regimes.

Technically speaking, the number of 'irreducible' divergences is controlled by the highest power of momenta or by the scaling dimension of the contact potential, not by the times of iteration in LSE. As the scaling dimension of a potential is still finite in pionfull EFT due to truncation, we feel tempted to speculate that similar 'finiteness' may also be true in pionfull EFT.

After making the above observations, it remains to subtract the 'irreducible' divergences and to fix the residual constants using appropriate boundary conditions, which will be addressed in next subsection. Here we briefly remark on a statement that renormalization is done after cut-off independence is achieved, which is true in perturbation theory as any residual term can be absorbed into couplings through redefinition. In nonperturbative cases, however, it is difficult or even impossible to absorb all the extra finite constants into the couplings while keeping the closed-form T matrices intact. Thus, cut-off independence does not exactly mean that the resulting quantities are physically faithful in nonperturbative regimes. That is why people often turn to perturbative approaches in practices.

C. Underlying theory perspective

We now turn to the underlying theory (UT) perspective. In such a perspective, an EFT just provides a simple parametrization and organization of all the amplitudes that are calculable in a well-defined manner in the underlying theory.

Suppose we start the calculation of a low-energy (LE) process from the a complete theory that underlies an EFT in consideration, then the results must be well defined. If we start the calculation with the EFT formulation, it means that the LE projection operation ($\breve{\mathcal{P}}_{\mathtt{LE}}$) has been performed implicitly before loop integrations as the EFT propagators and vertices are must first be obtained from LE projection. The problem is that such LE projection usually does not commute with loop integrations, thus, divergences arise from the wrong order of operation. At one-loop level, we define the commutator of the two operation as below:

$$\text{C.T.} \equiv [\breve{\mathcal{P}}_{\mathtt{LE}}, \int d\mu(l)]. \tag{57}$$

Rearranging the operations in Eq.(57), we have,

$$\breve{\mathcal{P}}_{\mathtt{LE}}\left[\int d\mu(l) f(l,\cdots)\right] = \int d\mu(l)\breve{\mathcal{P}}_{\mathtt{LE}}\left[f(l,\cdots)\right] + \text{C.T.}\left[f(l,\cdots)\right], \tag{58}$$

with $f(l,\cdots)$ denoting the integrand for an EFT process. Obviously, the *commutator in (57) just provides the counter-term or subtraction operation* needed in EFT for removing the divergences in the integral $\int d\mu(l)\breve{\mathcal{P}}_{\mathtt{LE}}\left[f(l,\cdots)\right]$ in order to recover the finite integral $\breve{\mathcal{P}}_{\mathtt{LE}}\left[\int d\mu(l) f(l,\cdots)\right]$ in UT. So, counter-terms or subtractions are intrinsically originated from the operations of LE projection and loop integrations that are indispensable in any sensible construction of EFT. Accordingly, subtractions must be implemented at loop level in effect, a natural observation from the underlying theory perspective. In perturbative contexts, subtractions/counterterms could be readily realized through local operators in EFT Lagrangian. In nonperturbative contexts, however, such a realization is not generally guaranteed, we are forced to adhere to the original loop-level subtractions/counterterms or equivalent operations[17].

Thus, both the closed-form T matrices and the underlying theory perspective require that subtractions be performed at the level of (loop) integrals in effect through whatever means that makes sense[‡]. In EFT($\not\pi$), such subtractions are straightforward to perform in the parametrization $\mathcal{I}(E)$, resulting in residual ambiguous parameters (also denoted as $[J...]$) to be fixed through appropriate boundary conditions. This is now a well accepted algorithm in doing the nonperturbative renormalization of EFT, see a recent review[73]. In a sense, the renormalization of Schrödinger equations (or Lippmann-Schwinger equations) á la Lepage adopted in Refs.[20–25, 34–36] can be seen as an instance of implementing subtractions at loop level and then treating the parameters that could not be absorbed into coupling constants as independent parameters to be fixed separately.

[‡] In our previous work[47], the counterterms in the closed-form T matrices have been termed as 'endogenous' counterterms. Therefore, 'endogenous' counterterms are just the ones that could effectively perform subtractions at loop level in nonperturbative regimes.

D. The notion of scenario of EFT

Now we recapitulate the foregoing analysis on the closed-form T matrices as below: (1) Nonperturbative divergences intrinsically mismatch with the EFT couplings or interactions in the truncated 'space'; (2) Fortunately, the 'unmatched' divergences are finitely many at a given order of potential truncation, so the whole issue is still tractable and hence renormalizable in nonperturbative sense; (3) The 'unmatched' divergences have to be subtracted at loop level with the residual parameters being physical and independent ones $[J^{(\mathrm{phys})}_{\dots}]$; (4) Then, a novel concept intrinsic of nonperturbative formulation, the 'scenario of EFT' ($\mathcal{S}_{\mathrm{EFT}}$), naturally emerges in the parametrization of the closed-form T matrices[54, 63]:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{S}_{\mathrm{EFT}} &= [C_{\dots}(\mu)] \oplus \{[J^{(\mathrm{phys})}_{\dots}] \oplus [J_{\dots}(\mu)]\} \\ &= \{[C_{\dots}(\mu)] \oplus [J_{\dots}(\mu)]\} \oplus [J^{(\mathrm{phys})}_{\dots}] \\ &= [C^{(\mathrm{phys})}_{\dots}] \oplus [J^{(\mathrm{phys})}_{\dots}],\end{aligned} \tag{59}$$

with μ being the running scale in $\mathrm{EFT}(\not\pi)$. Namely, a scenario consists of EFT couplings and complementary parameters that only arise from loop integrals; (5) Direct link between EFT power counting and nonperturbative subtractions/counterterms is lost due to the mismatch mentioned above. EFT power counting could only be manifested through the renormalized EFT couplings, not directly applicable to the bare objects or counterterms in nonperturbative regimes[18].

Therefore, we anticipate that the scenario structures just delineated above must be effectively incorporated somehow in the EFT descriptions of the NN sector. In this regard, at least the approaches adopted in Refs.[20–25, 34–36, 58] all essentially incorporate such notion of scenario. For example, the separation scale λ ($\sim$ 750MeV) in Ref.[58] essentially plays the roles of the additional parameters that are complementary to EFT couplings in contrast to the EFT running scale μ that is of order m_π. In other words, the discrimination between μ and λ is necessary and natural in the light of EFT scenario. Of course, such notion of EFT scenario could not be fully appreciated in the Wilsonian RGE analysis of EFT couplings as it is focused on EFT couplings, not on the full scenario 'space'[62]. The indispensability of the complementary scenario parameters could only be seen in the 'full' (closed-form) amplitudes or T matrices. In practice, such parameters could appear in various disguises, see, e.g., Refs.[20–25, 34–39, 51–53, 58], or even embodied somehow in different specification of 'dynamical' degrees[55, 56].

In our analysis performed so far no deformation or extra construction has been introduced into the EFT framework. All the notions and observations addressed above are merely natural consequences of the closed-form T matrices that could not be foreseeable in perturbative context. Hence, the original goal of EFT approach–providing field theoretical foundations to nuclear physics–is preserved. Throughout the whole analysis, the stringent constraints imposed by the closed-form T matrices are not circumvented, instead, they are directly confronted, exploited and finally turned into virtues in understanding the whole issue within field theoretical framework.

E. Nonperturbative running couplings

As was shown above, the closed-form T matrices require all the parameters generated from loop-level subtractions to be discriminated into two subsets: one collects the physical or RG invariant parameters that are complementary to couplings, the other consists of the running ones that are intertwined with the couplings. Hence, the couplings develop nonperturbative running behaviors, which could be easily demonstrated with the coupled channels ${}^3S_1$–${}^3D_1$ at order $\Delta = 2$, where J_0 is the only physical complementary parameter: $\mathcal{N}_1 = 0,\ \mathcal{N}_0 = (1 - C_{0;ss}J_3)^2,\ \mathcal{D}_1 = -C^2_{2;sd},\ \mathcal{D}_{sd} = C_{2;sd}(1 - C_{2;ss}J_3),\ \mathcal{D}_0 = \delta_{0;0} + \delta_{0;1}p^2$, with

$$\delta_{0;0} = C_{0;ss} + (C^2_{2;ss} + C^2_{2;sd})J_5, \quad \delta_{0;1} = 2C_{2;ss} + (C^2_{2;sd} - C^2_{2;ss})J_3. \tag{60}$$

Then, according to Sect. III A, the following combinations are RG invariants besides J_0:

$$\alpha_0 = \frac{\delta_{0;0}}{\mathcal{N}_0},\ \alpha_2 = \frac{\delta_{0;1}}{\mathcal{N}_0},\ \beta = \frac{\mathcal{D}_{sd}}{\mathcal{N}_0}, \tag{61}$$

then the T matrices can be physically parametrized as below:

$$\frac{1}{T_{ss}} = \mathcal{I}_0 + \frac{1}{\alpha_0 + \alpha_2 p^2 - \mathcal{I}_0 \beta^2 p^4}, \tag{62}$$

$$\frac{1}{T_{dd}} = \mathcal{I}_0 + \frac{1 + (\alpha_0 + \alpha_2 p^2)\mathcal{I}_0}{-\mathcal{I}_0 \beta^2 p^4}, \tag{63}$$

$$\frac{1}{T_{sd}} = \frac{1 + (\alpha_0 + \alpha_2 p^2)\mathcal{I}_0 - \mathcal{I}_0^2 \beta^2 p^4}{\beta p^2}. \tag{64}$$

From these physical parameters, we could find the running couplings that absorb the running parameters J_3 and J_5:

$$C_{0;ss} = \frac{\alpha_0 - \beta^2 J_5}{\xi^2} - \frac{J_5}{J_3^2}\left(1 - \frac{1}{\xi}\right)^2, \tag{65}$$

$$C_{2,ss} = \frac{1}{J_3}\left(1 - \frac{1}{\xi}\right),\ C_{2;sd} = \frac{\beta}{\xi}, \tag{66}$$

$$\xi \equiv \sqrt{1 + \alpha_2 J_3 - \beta^2 J_3^2}. \tag{67}$$

These nonperturbative running couplings possess both IR and UV fixed points in literal sense

$$C^{(\mathrm{IR})}_{0;ss} = \alpha_0,\ C^{(\mathrm{IR})}_{2;ss} = \frac{\alpha_2}{2},\ C^{(\mathrm{IR})}_{2;sd} = \beta, \tag{68}$$

$$C^{(\mathrm{UV})}_{0;ss} = 0,\ C^{(\mathrm{UV})}_{2;ss} = 0,\ C^{(\mathrm{UV})}_{2;sd} = 0. \tag{69}$$

Like the ${}^1S_0$ case[47], these nonperturbative running couplings all vanish in UV regions as they are only low-energy couplings that will naturally be dominated and superseded by the couplings that govern the interactions in UV regions. Actually, the EFT description breaks down before the running scale goes to the UV end as these nonperturbative running couplings blow up already at a finite J_3:

$$J_{3;\pm} = \frac{\alpha_2 \pm \sqrt{\alpha_2^2 + 4\beta^2}}{2\beta^2}. \tag{70}$$

This property also corroborates the fact that this EFT only makes sense below a physical upper scale. There is no point in letting the running scale or the subtraction point take very large values. In pionfull EFT, of course, it is an extremely challenging task to correctly calculate the contributions from all the intermediate states, especially the sophisticated suppression of all the modes beyond the upper scale.

IV. VARIOUS SCENARIOS OF EFT($\not\pi$)

A. High- and low-energy behaviors

First, let us entertain ourselves with some interesting estimates about the high- and low-energy on-shell behaviors of the closed-form T matrices obtained above, which is straightforward to see from their transparent p dependence.

From Appendix C, one could easily read off the following high-energy or UV on-shell behaviors (i.e., $p \to$ large) at truncation order $\Delta = 4$:

$$\frac{1}{T_{ss}} = J_0 + i\frac{M}{4\pi}p + o(p^{-2}), \tag{71}$$

$$\frac{1}{T_{dd}} = J_0 + i\frac{M}{4\pi}p + o(p^{-2}), \tag{72}$$

$$T_{sd} = T_{ds} = o(p^{-6}). \tag{73}$$

In terms of the parametrization defined in Eq.(1), this is:

$$\delta^{(\mathrm{HE})}_{^3S_1}(p) = \left(n_s + \frac{1}{2}\right)\pi + o(p^{-2}), \quad n_s \in Z, \tag{74}$$

$$\delta^{(\mathrm{HE})}_{^3D_1}(p) = \left(n_d + \frac{1}{2}\right)\pi + o(p^{-2}), \quad n_d \in Z, \tag{75}$$

$$\epsilon^{(\mathrm{HE})}(p) = n_\epsilon \pi + o(p^{-5}), \quad n_\epsilon \in Z. \tag{76}$$

Of course, such high-energy behaviors and their significance could not be taken seriously for the realistic NN scattering in terms of EFT($\not{\pi}$) which is only a valid description well below 1 GeV. However, as a general theoretical formulation for non-relativistic systems, such behaviors might be physically reasonable in certain systems that will be studied elsewhere. The point we wish to make is that, such high-energy or UV behaviors are compatible with unitarity.

Meanwhile, in the low-energy or infrared limit ($p \to 0$), we have

$$\frac{1}{T_{ss}} = J_0 + \frac{\nu_{0;0}}{\delta_{0;0}} + o(p), \tag{77}$$

$$\frac{p^4}{T_{dd}} = \frac{\nu_{0;0} + J_0\delta_{0;0}}{\nu_{1;0} + J_0\delta_{1;0}} + o(p), \tag{78}$$

$$T_{sd} = T_{ds} = o(p^2), \tag{79}$$

and

$$\delta_{^3S_1}(0) = n_S\pi, \quad n_S \in Z, \tag{80}$$

$$\delta_{^3D_1}(0) = n_D\pi, \quad n_D \in Z, \tag{81}$$

$$\epsilon(0) = n_E\pi, \quad n_E \in Z. \tag{82}$$

For the realistic NN scattering, we know that $n_S = 1, n_D = n_E = 0$. Obviously, these behaviors are also compatible with unitarity. These low-energy or infrared limit behaviors are directly related to the effective range expansion (ERE) within the realm of EFT($\not{\pi}$). We will examine the ERE parameters in details in Sect. IV D.

We note that the foregoing behaviors are obtained from the expressions of the parameters $[\mathcal{N}..., \mathcal{D}...]$ as monomials of on-shell momentum squared (p^2) at order $\Delta = 4$, where the highest power '$\bar{\omega}$' of each monomial can be read off from the expressions listed in Appendix C: $\bar{\omega}_{\mathcal{D}_0} = 4$, $\bar{\omega}_{\mathcal{D}_1} = \bar{\omega}_{\mathcal{N}_0} = 3$, $\bar{\omega}_{\mathcal{N}_1} = \bar{\omega}_{\mathcal{D}_{sd}} = 2$. Then it is rational to expect that the following ranking should hold at higher order of truncations:

$$\begin{aligned} &\bar{\omega}_{\mathcal{D}_0} > \bar{\omega}_{\mathcal{D}_1},\ \bar{\omega}_{\mathcal{N}_0} > \bar{\omega}_{\mathcal{N}_1},\ \bar{\omega}_{\mathcal{D}_0} > \bar{\omega}_{\mathcal{N}_0}, \\ &\min\{\bar{\omega}_{\mathcal{D}_1}, \bar{\omega}_{\mathcal{N}_0}\} > \bar{\omega}_{\mathcal{D}_{sd}}. \end{aligned} \tag{83}$$

Then one may be convinced through the above rankings that the above limiting behaviors should qualitatively persist at higher orders of truncation.

B. Scale hierarchy and scenarios

In the following, we examine the behaviors of the closed form T matrices obtained above in the light of EFT scenario and extend the preliminary analysis given in Ref.[63]. Obviously, different values of the scenario parameters will lead to different ratios constructed with the coefficients in the p^2 expansion of $[\mathcal{N}..., \mathcal{D}...]$, hence different physical behaviors in terms of the closed-form T matrices. Reversely, the correspondence between physical behaviors and these ratios also constrains the choices for EFT scenarios. To study the physical behaviors of the T matrices and their phenomenological consequences, we first perform some magnitude order analysis of various parameters involved. Here and below, the subscript '($\not{\pi}$)' in $\Lambda_{(\not{\pi})}$ and $Q_{(\not{\pi})}$ is omitted to avoid heavy symbolism.

Generically, the scenario parameters $[C...]$ and $[J...]$ depend on the ratio $\epsilon \equiv Q/\Lambda$ or μ/Λ that stipulates EFT expansion due to scale hierarchy: $\mu \sim Q,\ Q \ll \Lambda$. For the realistic NN scattering in the realm of

EFT($\not\pi$) where $\Lambda \simeq m_\pi,\ a^{-1}({}^3S_1) \simeq 36.4\text{MeV},\ a^{-1}({}^1S_0) \simeq -8.3\text{MeV}$, etc., we could envisage the following scale hierarchy:

$$\epsilon \simeq \frac{1}{4}:\ \frac{1}{a({}^3S_1)} \simeq \epsilon\Lambda,\ \frac{1}{a({}^1S_0)} \simeq -\epsilon^2\Lambda, \cdots. \tag{84}$$

To proceed, we introduce the following dimensionless parameters for the couplings and $J_{\cdots}$:

$$\begin{aligned} C_{2n;\cdots} &= \frac{4\pi}{M}\frac{\tilde{c}_{2n;\cdots}(\epsilon)}{2^n\Lambda^{2n+1}}, \qquad (85)\\ J_{2k+1} &= \frac{M\mu^{2k+1}}{4\pi}\tilde{j}_{2k+1}(\epsilon), \qquad (86)\end{aligned}$$

where $\tilde{c}_{2n;\cdots}$ may be $\mathcal{O}(1)$ multiplied by powers of '2' due to our convention. For the complementary parameters $[J^{(\text{phys})}_{2k+1}]$, '$\mu^{2k+1}$' is replaced with '$Q^{2k+1}$' in (86).

In this report, we will consider the following three typical scenarios for simplicity:

$$\begin{aligned} &\text{A:} \quad \tilde{c}_{2n;\cdots} \sim \mathcal{O}(1);\ \tilde{j}_{2k+1} \sim \mathcal{O}(1);\ J_0 \sim \frac{M}{4\pi}Q; \qquad (87)\\ &\text{B:} \quad \tilde{c}_{2n;\cdots} \sim \frac{\mathcal{O}(1)}{\epsilon^{n+1}};\ \tilde{j}_{2k+1} \sim \mathcal{O}(1);\ J_0 \sim \frac{M}{4\pi}Q; \qquad (88)\\ &\text{C:} \quad \tilde{c}_{2n;\cdots} \sim \mathcal{O}(1);\ \tilde{j}_{2k+1} \sim \mathcal{O}(1);\ J_0 \sim \frac{M}{4\pi}\Lambda. \qquad (89)\end{aligned}$$

Obviously, scenario A is given in terms of conventional EFT power counting for couplings and a usual prescription for $[J_{\cdots}]$, it will lead to natural ERE parameters, hence a natural scenario. Scenario B looks more complicated as unconventional power counting of couplings is incorporated: The couplings are unnaturally large. This scenario will indeed lead to unnatural scattering behaviors. In scenario C, everything is simply the same as in scenario A except $J_0 (= \text{Re}[\mathcal{I}_0])$. This is because as a physical or RG invariant parameter (see Eq.(54)), J_0 could simply be a function of the physical upper scale Λ only[47, 54, 61]. Or, due to its uniquely 'isolated' position in the closed-form T matrices, we promote it to be a fundamental parameter that scales as $C^{-1}_{0;ss}$ in scenario C!

Actually, scenario C is 'natural' in the sense that all the scales involved are 'naturally' sized, but it could also lead to unnatural scattering lengths for S-waves upon reasonable fine-tunings without using unconventional EFT power counting, see below. In a sense, our formulation (in the simple scenario C) provides a 'physical' and natural foundation to the EFT treatments (see reviews[5–9]) that employ various forms of fine-tuning. Recently, it is emphasized that fine-tuning is at least partly responsible to the complexity in nuclear physics[74]. In our view, the field theoretical origin of such complexity or fine-tuning lies in the nonperturbative nature of EFT renormalization, or, specifically, in the nonperturbative scenario of EFT. Further remarks on fine-tuning will be given in Sect. IV E.

C. T matrices in various scenarios

In the closed-form T matrices, fine-tunings may 'naturally' occur among the scenario parameters and lead to some intriguing phenomena (like unnatural scattering lengths). For our purposes below, it is convenient to define the fine-tuning in a scenario in terms of the dimensionless couplings $[\tilde{c}_{\cdots}(\epsilon)]$ only:

$$\frac{\tilde{c}_{2n;\cdots}(\epsilon)}{|\tilde{c}_{2n;\cdots}(0)|} = \pm 1 + o(\epsilon^\sigma), \quad \sigma \in (0, \kappa), \tag{90}$$

where κ denotes the power exponent of the next-to-leading order contributions to the coefficients $[\nu_{\cdots}, \delta_{\cdots}]$ (C.f. Appendix C) in ϵ expansion. Evidently, it makes no sense to let the fine-tuning exponent σ take any real number larger than κ. This is the guiding principle for determining the choice of fine-tuning in the following discussions. Larger κ means larger capacity for fine-tuning, less sensitivity to higher order contributions, and finally more credits for EFT approach in that scenario. The exponent κ in a scenario could be obtained through the examination of the ϵ dependence of the T matrices. For purpose of demonstration, we will simply choose $\tilde{j}_{2k+1} = 1$ or

$$J_{2k+1} = \frac{M}{4\pi} \left(\epsilon \Lambda\right)^{2k+1}$$

in the following calculations.

1. Scenario A

With the above preparations, one could find that the on-shell T matrices for the ${}^3S_1$–${}^3D_1$ channels would depend on the expansion parameter ϵ as follows after replacing μ and Q with $\epsilon\Lambda$,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{4\pi/T_{ss}}{M\Lambda} &= \epsilon + \frac{ip}{\Lambda} + \frac{1 + o(\epsilon^3) + \frac{\epsilon^3 p^2}{\Lambda^2}\mathcal{O}\left(1 + o(\epsilon^3)\right) + \cdots}{\tilde{c}_{0;ss} + o(\epsilon^5) + \frac{p^2}{\Lambda^2}\mathcal{O}\left(1 + o(\epsilon^3)\right) + \cdots}, \\ &\cdots \end{aligned} \tag{91}$$

Closer study shows that for $\tilde{c}_{0;ss}$ in this scenario: $\kappa_{\text{A}} = 3$, which means a large capacity that favors stable fine-tuning against higher order corrections. However, this favorable capacity for fine-tuning is useless, which could be seen through the following simple computations in ${}^3S_1$ channel:

$$\frac{1}{a} \sim -\frac{\Lambda}{\tilde{c}_{0;ss}} \sim \Lambda\mathcal{O}(1), \quad r_e \sim 2\frac{\tilde{c}_{2;ss}}{\Lambda} \sim \frac{\mathcal{O}(1)}{\Lambda}. \tag{92}$$

That is, the naturalness of these two effective range expansion (ERE) parameters could not be altered by any fine-tuning in this scenario or system. Therefore, to obtain unnatural scattering length within the realm of EFT($\not\pi$), one must alter either the EFT power counting for couplings (like scenario B) or the scaling laws of the parameters $[J_{\cdots}]$ (like scenario C), or both.

2. Scenario B

We note in passing that this scenario mimics the so-called KSW[10] scheme in the part of couplings within the realm of EFT($\not\pi$) while taking the same prescription of $J_{\cdots}$ as in scenario A. Like above, in this scenario, we could obtain the following ϵ dependence of the T matrices,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{4\pi/T_{ss}}{M\Lambda} &= \epsilon + \frac{ip}{\Lambda} + \frac{1 + o(\epsilon) + \frac{p^2}{\Lambda^2}\mathcal{O}(1 + o(\epsilon)) + \cdots}{\tilde{c}_{0;ss} + o(\epsilon) + \frac{p^2}{\epsilon\Lambda^2}\mathcal{O}(1 + o(\epsilon)) + \cdots}, \\ &\cdots \end{aligned} \tag{93}$$

Note that, in our convention, $\tilde{c}_{2n;\cdots} \sim \epsilon^{-n-1}$ in scenario B. Here, one could find that $\kappa_{\text{B}} = 1$ for $\tilde{c}_{0;ss}$, which means much less capacity for fine-tuning, an unfavorable point for this scenario. Nevertheless, an unnaturally sized scattering length could indeed be achieved for ${}^3S_1$ channel in this scenario as a result of the unconventional rating of the couplings:

$$\frac{1}{a} \sim -\Lambda\left(\epsilon + \frac{1}{\tilde{c}_{0;ss}}\right) \sim \Lambda \cdot o(\epsilon), \quad r_e \sim 2\frac{\epsilon^2\tilde{c}_{2;ss}}{\Lambda} \sim \frac{\mathcal{O}(1)}{\Lambda}. \tag{94}$$

However, this scenario would lead to other unnaturally large ERE parameters in S-channels also due to the unconventional rating of couplings, see next subsection. As a matter of fact, it is possible to achieve unnatural scattering lengths without modifying the conventional power counting: To tap the capacity stored in the complementary parameters. To this end, we consider below the simplest case of such scenarios.

3. Scenario C

In this scenario, we could find the following ϵ dependence in the T matrices:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{4\pi/T_{ss}}{M\Lambda} &= 1+\frac{ip}{\Lambda}+\frac{1+o(\epsilon^3)+\frac{\epsilon^3p^2}{\Lambda^2}\mathcal{O}\left(1+o(\epsilon^3)\right)+\cdots}{\tilde{c}_{0;ss}+o(\epsilon^5)+\frac{p^2}{\Lambda^2}\mathcal{O}\left(1+o(\epsilon^3)\right)+\cdots}, \\ &\cdots \end{aligned} \tag{95}$$

With such T matrices we find that $\kappa_{\mathrm{C}}=3$ for $\tilde{c}_{0;ss}$, a large capacity for fine-tuning. More pleasantly, this large capacity for fine-tuning is pivotal here for producing large scattering length. To see this point, we perform similar computations as above and find that

$$\frac{1}{a}\sim-\Lambda\left(1+\frac{1}{\tilde{c}_{0;ss}}\right)\sim\Lambda\cdot o(\epsilon^\sigma),\quad r_e\sim 2\frac{\tilde{c}_{2;ss}}{\Lambda}\sim\frac{\mathcal{O}(1)}{\Lambda}. \tag{96}$$

Here the fine-tuning $\tilde{c}_{0;ss}=-1-o(\epsilon^\sigma)$ with $\sigma\in(0,3)$ is employed. For the realistic $^3S_1$ scattering, it suffices to choose $\sigma=1$ so that $a^{-1}\sim\epsilon\Lambda$. Thus, in the realm of EFT($\not\pi$), a natural effective range r_e and an unnatural scattering length could be 'naturally' achieved in $^3S_1$ channel in scenario C. Naturally, it is more instructive to compute and compare more ERE parameters across various scenarios. This will be done below.

D. Effective range expansion in various scenarios and PSA data

To proceed, we start with the ERE in L-wave defined as below:

$$p^{2L+1}\cot\delta_L(p)=-\frac{1}{a}+\frac{1}{2}r_ep^2+\sum_{n=2}^{\infty}v_np^{2n}. \tag{97}$$

In $^3S_1$–$^3D_1$, the phase shifts are given as below in terms of the parametrization given in Eq.(1):

$$e^{2i\delta_s(p)} = \frac{1-i\frac{Mp}{2\pi}T_{ss}(p)}{\sqrt{1-\frac{M^2p^2}{4\pi^2}|T_{sd}(p)|^2}}, \tag{98}$$

$$e^{2i\delta_d(p)} = \frac{1-i\frac{Mp}{2\pi}T_{dd}(p)}{\sqrt{1-\frac{M^2p^2}{4\pi^2}|T_{sd}(p)|^2}}. \tag{99}$$

After some algebra, we could find the following simple relations:

$$p\ \cot\delta_s(p) = -\frac{4\pi}{M}\left\{\mathrm{Re}\left[\frac{1}{T_{ss}}\right]+o\left(p^{10}\right)\right\}, \tag{100}$$

$$p^5\cot\delta_d(p) = -\frac{4\pi}{M}\left\{\frac{p^4}{\mathrm{Re}[T_{dd}]}+o\left(p^6\right)\right\}, \tag{101}$$

according to which, we could compute the ERE parameters up to v_4 in $^3S_1$ simply using T_{ss}, while in $^3D_1$, it is legitimate to compute the ERE parameters up to v_2 with T_{dd}. The resulting expressions for these ERE parameters must be rational functions in terms of $[\nu_{\dots},\delta_{\dots}]$ and J_0. For example, the scattering lengths for $^3S_1$ and $^3D_1$ can be expressed exactly in terms of $\nu_{0;0},\delta_{0;0},\nu_{1;0},\delta_{1;0}$ and J_0 as below,

$$\frac{1}{a(^3S_1)} = -\frac{4\pi}{M}\frac{\nu_{0;0}+J_0\delta_{0;0}}{\delta_{0;0}}, \tag{102}$$

$$\frac{1}{a(^3D_1)} = -\frac{4\pi}{M}\frac{\nu_{0;0}+J_0\delta_{0;0}}{\nu_{1;0}+J_0\delta_{1;0}}, \tag{103}$$

which could be further expanded in terms of ϵ.

The detailed ϵ dependence of the ERE parameters is further determined by the fine-tuning of relevant couplings in a scenario. The results about the first two orders in ϵ expansion are summarized in tables I and II, where the following two primary fine-tuning patterns (tuning I and II) for the leading coupling $\tilde{c}_{0;ss}$ are demonstrated as we are at this moment mainly concerned with the scattering length for ${}^3S_1$:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Tuning I:} \quad & \tilde{c}_{0;ss} \sim -1 - o(\epsilon) \text{ (scenario A,C)}, \quad \epsilon\tilde{c}_{0;ss} \sim -1 - o(\epsilon) \text{ (scenario B)}; \\ \text{Tuning II:} \quad & \tilde{c}_{0;ss} \sim -1 - o(\epsilon^2) \text{ (scenario A,C)}. \end{aligned}$$

Note that it does not makes sense to consider the tuning II in scenario B as it is simply not allowed there due to $\kappa_{\text{B}} = 1$. Fine-tuning of higher couplings will be considered later for higher ERE parameters. We should also note that in order to yield a scattering length of order $(\epsilon\Lambda)^{-1}$ in scenario B, one should use $\epsilon\tilde{c}_{0;ss} \sim +1 + o(\epsilon)$ instead of tuning I, with the rest being essentially not affected. Thus, different scenarios would embody different tuning mechanisms to yield the *same scattering length.* Of course, they will not always agree with each other about the higher ERE parameters. Then for one particular system, only one scenario will survive experimental tests. Interestingly, as

$$\frac{a({}^3S_1)}{a({}^3D_1)} = \frac{\delta_{0;0}}{\nu_{1;0} + J_0\delta_{1;0}}, \tag{104}$$

these two scattering lengths could be both naturally sized (scenario A) or both unnaturally sized (scenario B and C).

TABLE I: Naturalness(N)/unnaturalness(U) of ERE parameters in ${}^3S_1$–${}^3D_1$:$\tilde{c}_{0;ss} \sim -1 - o(\epsilon)$

ERE	Scenario A	Scenario B	Scenario C
S: $\Lambda \cdot a$	$\mathcal{O}(1 + o(\epsilon))$	$\epsilon^{-2}\mathcal{O}(1 + o(\epsilon))$	$\epsilon^{-1}\mathcal{O}(1 + o(\epsilon))$
$\Lambda \cdot r_e$	$2\tilde{c}_{2;ss} + o(\epsilon)$	$2\epsilon^2\tilde{c}_{2;ss} + o(\epsilon)$	$2\tilde{c}_{2;ss} + o(\epsilon)$
$\Lambda^3 \cdot v_2$	$\mathcal{O}(1 + o(\epsilon))$	$\epsilon^{-1}\mathcal{O}(1 + o(\epsilon))$	$\mathcal{O}(1 + o(\epsilon))$
$\Lambda^5 \cdot v_3$	$\mathcal{O}(1 + o(\epsilon))$	$\epsilon^{-2}\mathcal{O}(1 + o(\epsilon))$	$\mathcal{O}(1 + o(\epsilon))$
$\Lambda^7 \cdot v_4$	$\mathcal{O}(1 + o(\epsilon))$	$\epsilon^{-3}\mathcal{O}(1 + o(\epsilon))$	$\mathcal{O}(1 + o(\epsilon))$
D: $\Lambda^5 \cdot a$	$\mathcal{O}(1 + o(\epsilon))$	$\epsilon^{-4}\mathcal{O}(1 + o(\epsilon))$	$\epsilon^{-1}\mathcal{O}(1 + o(\epsilon))$
$\Lambda^{-3} \cdot r_e$	$2\mathcal{O}(1 + o(\epsilon))$	$2\mathcal{O}(1 + o(\epsilon))$	$2\epsilon^{-1}\mathcal{O}(1 + o(\epsilon))$
$\Lambda^{-1} \cdot v_2$	$\mathcal{O}(1 + o(\epsilon))$	$\epsilon^{-3}\mathcal{O}(1 + o(\epsilon))$	$\epsilon^{-2}\mathcal{O}(1 + o(\epsilon))$

TABLE II: Naturalness(N)/unnaturalness(U) of ERE parameters in ${}^3S_1$–${}^3D_1$:$\tilde{c}_{0;ss} \sim -1 - o(\epsilon^2)$

ERE	Scenario A	Scenario C
${}^3S_1$: $\Lambda \cdot a$	$\mathcal{O}(1 + o(\epsilon))$	$\epsilon^{-2}\mathcal{O}(1 + o(\epsilon))$
$\Lambda \cdot r_e$	$2\tilde{c}_{2;ss} + o(\epsilon^2)$	$2\tilde{c}_{2;ss} + o(\epsilon^2)$
$\Lambda^3 \cdot v_2$	$\mathcal{O}(1 + o(\epsilon))$	$\mathcal{O}(1 + o(\epsilon^2))$
$\Lambda^5 \cdot v_3$	$\mathcal{O}(1 + o(\epsilon))$	$\mathcal{O}(1 + o(\epsilon^2))$
$\Lambda^7 \cdot v_4$	$\mathcal{O}(1 + o(\epsilon))$	$\mathcal{O}(1 + o(\epsilon^2))$
${}^3D_1$: $\Lambda^5 \cdot a$	$\mathcal{O}(1 + o(\epsilon))$	$\epsilon^{-2}\mathcal{O}(1 + o(\epsilon))$
$\Lambda^{-3} \cdot r_e$	$2\mathcal{O}(1 + o(\epsilon))$	$2\epsilon^{-2}\mathcal{O}(1 + o(\epsilon))$
$\Lambda^{-1} \cdot v_2$	$\mathcal{O}(1 + o(\epsilon))$	$\epsilon^{-4}\mathcal{O}(1 + o(\epsilon))$

For comparison, we also present here the analysis for the ${}^1S_0$ channel in table III, where to yield a much larger ($\sim \epsilon^{-2}$) scattering length, the tuning $\epsilon\tilde{c}_0 \sim -1 + o(\epsilon)$ is used in scenarios B while in scenario C we employ the tuning $\tilde{c}_0 \sim -1 + o(\epsilon^2)$.

TABLE III: Naturalness(N)/unnaturalness(U) of ERE parameters in ${}^1S_0$

ERE	Scenario A	Scenario B	Scenario C
$\Lambda \cdot a$	$\mathcal{O}(1+o(\epsilon))$	$\epsilon^{-2}\mathcal{O}(1+o(\epsilon))$	$\epsilon^{-2}\mathcal{O}(1+o(\epsilon))$
$\Lambda \cdot r_e$	$2\tilde{c}_2 + o(\epsilon)$	$2\epsilon^2\tilde{c}_2 + o(\epsilon)$	$2\tilde{c}_2 + o(\epsilon^2)$
$\Lambda^3 \cdot v_2$	$\mathcal{O}(1+o(\epsilon))$	$\epsilon^{-1}\mathcal{O}(1+o(\epsilon))$	$\mathcal{O}(1+o(\epsilon^2))$
$\Lambda^5 \cdot v_3$	$\mathcal{O}(1+o(\epsilon))$	$\epsilon^{-2}\mathcal{O}(1+o(\epsilon))$	$\mathcal{O}(1+o(\epsilon^2))$
$\Lambda^7 \cdot v_4$	$\mathcal{O}(1+o(\epsilon))$	$\epsilon^{-3}\mathcal{O}(1+o(\epsilon))$	$\mathcal{O}(1+o(\epsilon^2))$

In spite that the foregoing analysis appear to be quite crude, the basic features of the three typical scenarios are clearly revealed: Scenario A characterizes systems with natural scattering behaviors, while the rest two account for unnatural systems. For NN scattering, to see the rationality in choosing appropriate prescriptions rather than modifying the canonical EFT power counting, we perform some further magnitude analysis of the ERE parameters in ${}^3S_1$ and ${}^1S_0$ channels of the PSA data used in Ref.[75]. The results are given in table IV where we denoted the upper EFT scale and scaling parameter as $\tilde{\Lambda}$ and ε respectively, the actual values used in our analysis $\tilde{\Lambda}$ and ε are charged pion mass $m_{\pi^\pm}$ and $\frac{1}{4}$. From this table, one can see that the PSA data lead to small v_2 in comparison to all the three schemes above. In particular, the PSA data give an extremely small v_2 in ${}^3S_1$ channel.

TABLE IV: ERE parameters in S-waves: PSA data.

ERE	${}^3S_1$: data	scaling	${}^1S_0$: data	scaling
$\tilde{\Lambda} \cdot a$	$(0.26)^{-1}$	$\varepsilon^{-1}\mathcal{O}(1)$	$-(0.06)^{-1}$	$\varepsilon^{-2}\mathcal{O}(1)$
$\tilde{\Lambda} \cdot r_e$	$(0.81)^{-1}$	$\mathcal{O}(1)$	$(0.53)^{-1}$	$2\mathcal{O}(1)$
$\tilde{\Lambda}^3 \cdot v_2$	$(4.13)^{-3}$	$\varepsilon^3\mathcal{O}(1)$	$-(1.81)^{-3}$	$\varepsilon^{\frac{5}{4}}\mathcal{O}(1)$
$\tilde{\Lambda}^5 \cdot v_3$	$(1.53)^{-5}$	$\varepsilon^{\frac{3}{2}}\mathcal{O}(1)$	$(1.07)^{-5}$	$\mathcal{O}(1)$
$\tilde{\Lambda}^7 \cdot v_4$	$-(1.16)^{-7}$	$\varepsilon^{\frac{3}{4}}\mathcal{O}(1)$	$-(0.92)^{-7}$	$\mathcal{O}(1)$

Comparing tables I and II with the PSA data, it appears that the predictions for v_2, v_3 and v_4 of S-waves in scenario B are 'wrong': they are unnaturally 'large'. So there are huge 'gaps' between PSA data and scenario B:

$$
{}^3S_1: \quad \frac{v_{2;B}}{v_{2;P}} \sim \epsilon^{-4}, \ \frac{v_{3;B}}{v_{3;P}} \sim \epsilon^{-\frac{7}{2}}, \ \frac{v_{4;B}}{v_{4;P}} \sim \epsilon^{-\frac{15}{4}}, \tag{105}
$$

$$
{}^1S_0: \quad \frac{v_{2;B}}{v_{2;P}} \sim \epsilon^{-\frac{9}{4}}, \ \frac{v_{3;B}}{v_{3;P}} \sim \epsilon^{-2}, \ \frac{v_{4;B}}{v_{4;P}} \sim \epsilon^{-3}, \tag{106}
$$

with subscript '$\ldots_{;B}$' for scenario B while '$\ldots_{;P}$' for PSA. In the meantime, such 'gaps' are relatively smaller in scenario C:

$$
{}^3S_1: \quad \frac{v_{2;C}}{v_{2;P}} \sim \epsilon^{-3}, \ \frac{v_{3;C}}{v_{3;P}} \sim \epsilon^{-\frac{3}{2}}, \ \frac{v_{4;C}}{v_{4;P}} \sim \epsilon^{-\frac{3}{4}}, \tag{107}
$$

$$
{}^1S_0: \quad \frac{v_{2;C}}{v_{2;P}} \sim \epsilon^{-\frac{5}{4}}, \ \frac{v_{3;C}}{v_{3;P}} \sim \epsilon^{0}, \ \frac{v_{4;C}}{v_{4;P}} \sim \epsilon^{0}. \tag{108}
$$

Thus, scenario B seems to be disfavored in comparison with scenario C as the latter is relatively closer to the PSA data. In ${}^1S_0$, the agreement between scenario C and PSA data is almost complete.

As the numbers in tables I, II and III had been derived with simple fine-tunings of the lowest coupling $C_{0;\cdots}$ only, one may wonder what would happen after taking the fine-tunings of higher couplings into account. Looking at the actual expressions, one could find that higher ERE form factors $[v_k, k \geq 2]$ involve more higher couplings at the 'leading' order of ϵ expansion. This implies that cancelations may occur amongst the couplings involved after considering appropriate fine-tuning so that the resulting ERE form factors could be reduced in magnitude. As will be shown in next subsection, this could indeed happen in scenario C. In scenario B, however, such fine-tunings of higher couplings are hard to manipulate for two reasons: (1) On the one hand, there are much larger 'gaps' to be reduced, which in turn requires much larger capacity for fine-tuning; (2) On the other hand, there is actually little capacity for fine-tuning to be exploited as $\kappa_{\mathrm{B}} = 1$. So, this conflicting tension between larger 'gaps' and little capacity for fine-tuning means that the magnitude-reduction of higher ERE form factors in S-waves is practically impossible to achieve in scenario B. The little capacity for fine-tuning in fact stems from the unconventional rating of couplings in scenario B, i.e., they are larger than in scenario A or C. In this regard, scenario B, or a scenario with unconventional power counting of couplings, is strongly disfavored in the EFT description of NN scattering.

TABLE V: Low energy theorems in KSW

ERE	$^3S_1$	scaling	$^1S_0$	scaling
$v_2(\mathrm{fm}^3)$	-0.95	$\varepsilon^{\frac{11}{14}}\frac{\mathcal{O}(1)}{\tilde{\Lambda}^3}$	-3.3	$\varepsilon^{-\frac{1}{9}}\frac{\mathcal{O}(1)}{\tilde{\Lambda}^3}$
$v_3(\mathrm{fm}^5)$	$+4.6$	$\varepsilon^{\frac{1}{7}}\frac{\mathcal{O}(1)}{\tilde{\Lambda}^5}$	$+17.8$	$\varepsilon^{-\frac{5}{6}}\frac{\mathcal{O}(1)}{\tilde{\Lambda}^5}$
$v_4(\mathrm{fm}^7)$	-25	$\varepsilon^{-\frac{4}{7}}\frac{\mathcal{O}(1)}{\tilde{\Lambda}^7}$	-108	$\varepsilon^{-\frac{13}{8}}\frac{\mathcal{O}(1)}{\tilde{\Lambda}^7}$

More than a decade ago, treating pion exchanges perturbatively in NN scattering using KSW power counting was shown in Ref.[15, 16] to lead to some bad low energy theorems (LET), see table V. These LET's are qualitatively in agreement with our rough estimates in scenario B in that the ERE form factors derived there are also much larger (at least one order of ε^{-1}) than the PSA data:

$$\begin{aligned} {}^3S_1: &\quad \frac{v_{2;L}}{v_{2;P}} \sim \varepsilon^{-\frac{16}{7}}, \ \frac{v_{3;L}}{v_{3;P}} \sim \varepsilon^{-\frac{25}{18}}, \ \frac{v_{4;L}}{v_{4;P}} \sim \varepsilon^{-\frac{37}{28}}, \\ {}^1S_0: &\quad \frac{v_{2;L}}{v_{2;P}} \sim \varepsilon^{-\frac{32}{23}}, \ \frac{v_{3;L}}{v_{3;P}} \sim \varepsilon^{-\frac{10}{9}}, \ \frac{v_{4;L}}{v_{4;P}} \sim \varepsilon^{-\frac{4}{3}}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, the scenarios with unconventional power counting of couplings where couplings are promoted 'up' in magnitude seem to be problematic choices for NN scattering in lower partial waves.

E. Fine-tuning and hidden structures

In this subsection, we discuss the feasibility of deriving smaller higher ERE form factors in scenario C. It suffices to demonstrate it with v_2 in $^3S_1$ which is the smallest ERE parameter in S-waves according to the PSA data as listed in table IV.

1. *A small $v_2(^3S_1)$ in scenario C*

Let us first look at the detailed expression of v_2 in scenario C in leading orders of ϵ expansion:

$$\Lambda^3 \cdot v_2 = \frac{2\tilde{c}_{4;ss} + \tilde{\tilde{c}}_{4;ss} - 4\tilde{c}^2_{2;sd}}{4\tilde{c}^2_{0;ss}} - \frac{\tilde{c}^2_{2;ss}}{\tilde{c}^3_{0;ss}} + o(\epsilon^3), \tag{109}$$

from which it is clear that for the higher couplings $\tilde{c}_{2;ss}$, $\tilde{c}_{2;sd}$, $\tilde{c}_{4;ss}$ and $\tilde{\tilde{c}}_{4;ss}$, we still have a large capacity $\kappa = 3$ that could also be seen from the coefficients of 'p^2' and 'p^4' in the fraction part of T^{-1}_{ss}. That means, the fine-tuning exponent σ for these couplings also lies in the interval $(0, 3)$, just like that for $\tilde{c}_{0;ss}$. Then, a small v_2 of order '$o(\epsilon^3)$' would be resulted if the couplings conspire to essentially cancel out against each other on the right hand side of Eq.(109) up to order $o(\epsilon^3)$. Considering v_2 alone here, this could be achieved in a number of ways. For example, the following choices in combination with tuning I for $\tilde{c}_{0;ss}$ could result in a v_2 of the required size:

$$\left\{\begin{array}{l} \tilde{c}_{2;ss} \sim 1 - o(\epsilon^2) \\ \tilde{c}_{2;sd} \sim 1 - o(\epsilon^2) \\ \tilde{c}_{4;ss} \sim 1 + o(\epsilon) - o(\epsilon^2) \\ \tilde{\tilde{c}}_{4;ss} \sim -2 + 2o(\epsilon) - 2o(\epsilon^2) \\ \tilde{c}_{0;ss} \sim -1 - o(\epsilon) \end{array}\right\} \tag{110}$$

$$\Rightarrow \Lambda^3 v_2 \sim o(\epsilon^3). \tag{111}$$

Of course, other ERE parameters may impose further fine-tuning requirements for the couplings, which would effectively constrain the freedom in the choices of fine-tuning for all the couplings involved.

2. Combined constraints

The foregoing analysis shows that, to conform with the empirical sizes or values of the ERE form factors, the EFT couplings must be further constrained through fine-tuning. In other words, the couplings must be correlated somehow in the context of fine-tuning. Below we would like to provide another instance of deriving constraints or correlations for the couplings: The combining considerations of the fine-tuning requirements from the scattering lengths in ${}^1S_0$ and ${}^3S_1$ in scenario C. From our results given in the foregoing subsections, it suffices to consider the couplings at the lowest order.

To proceed, we adopt the following decomposition of contact NN potential at the leading order of truncation[76, 77]:

$$\begin{aligned} V_{NN}^{(0)} &= C_c + (\boldsymbol{\tau}_1 \cdot \boldsymbol{\tau}_2) C_{I;c} + (\boldsymbol{\sigma}_1 \cdot \boldsymbol{\sigma}_2) C_t \\ &\quad + (\boldsymbol{\tau}_1 \cdot \boldsymbol{\tau}_2)(\boldsymbol{\sigma}_1 \cdot \boldsymbol{\sigma}_2) C_{I;t}. \end{aligned} \tag{112}$$

Projecting it into partial waves, we have the following lowest order couplings for ${}^1S_0$ and ${}^3S_1$,

$$C_{{}^1S_0} = C_c + C_{I;c} - 3(C_t + C_{I;t}), \tag{113}$$

$$C_{{}^3S_1} = C_c + C_t - 3(C_{I;c} + C_{I;t}). \tag{114}$$

Then from tables I and III, the ERE analysis requires following equalities in scenario C

$$\frac{M\Lambda}{4\pi} C_{{}^1S_0} = -1 + o(\epsilon^2), \tag{115}$$

$$\frac{M\Lambda}{4\pi} C_{{}^3S_1} = -1 - o(\epsilon). \tag{116}$$

Now, it is evident that, the four lowest couplings $[C_c,\ C_t,\ C_{I;c},\ C_{I;t}]$ are correlated with each other in the leading order of ϵ expansion:

$$C_t(0) = C_{I;c}(0), \tag{117}$$

$$C_c(0) = 2C_{I;c}(0) + 3C_{I;t}(0) - 1. \tag{118}$$

In the EFT approach to NN scattering, these relations follow as corollaries in scenario C. They may be tested using other methods like lattice computation. Furthermore, if the assumption that $\frac{M\Lambda}{4\pi} C_c(0) = \frac{M\Lambda}{4\pi} C_t(0) = 1$ is reasonable, then the above relations imply that the fourth coupling $C_{I;t}$ is suppressed by at least one order of ϵ: $C_{I;t}(0) = 0,\ C_{I;t} = \frac{4\pi}{M\Lambda} o(\epsilon^a),\ a \geq 1$.

3. Interpretation

Now we make some attempts at the understanding and perhaps the interpretation of the above deductions concerning fine-tuning. We have shown that fine-tuning in combination with phenomenological requirements can lead us to arrive at quite some 'orders' or 'structures' hidden in the EFT couplings. These hidden

TABLE VI: ERE in variants of scenario B: $\epsilon\tilde{c}_{0;ss} \sim -1 - o(\epsilon)$

Variant	$\tilde{j}_{2k+1} = 1$	$\tilde{j}_{2k+1} = 0$	$\tilde{j}_{2k+1} = \epsilon^{3k+2}$
$S : \Lambda \cdot a$	$\epsilon^{-2}\mathcal{O}(1)$	$\epsilon^{-2}\mathcal{O}(1$	$\epsilon^{-2}\mathcal{O}(1)$
$\Lambda \cdot r_e$	$2\epsilon^2\tilde{c}_{2;ss}\mathcal{O}(1)$	$2\epsilon^2\tilde{c}_{2;ss}\mathcal{O}(1)$	$2\epsilon^2\tilde{c}_{2;ss}\mathcal{O}(1)$
$\Lambda^3 \cdot v_2$	$\epsilon^{-1}\mathcal{O}(1)$	$\epsilon^{-1}\mathcal{O}(1)$	$\epsilon^{-1}\mathcal{O}(1)$
$\Lambda^5 \cdot v_3$	$\epsilon^{-2}\mathcal{O}(1)$	$\epsilon^{-2}\mathcal{O}(1)$	$\epsilon^{-2}\mathcal{O}(1)$
$\Lambda^7 \cdot v_4$	$\epsilon^{-3}\mathcal{O}(1)$	$\epsilon^{-3}\mathcal{O}(1)$	$\epsilon^{-3}\mathcal{O}(1)$
$D : \Lambda^3 \cdot a$	$\epsilon^{-4}\mathcal{O}(1)$	$\epsilon^{-4}\mathcal{O}(1)$	$\epsilon^{-4}\mathcal{O}(1)$
$\Lambda^{-3} \cdot r_e$	$2\mathcal{O}(1)$	$2\mathcal{O}(1)$	$2\mathcal{O}(1)$
$\Lambda^{-1} v_2$	$\epsilon^{-3}\mathcal{O}(1)$	$\epsilon^{-3}\mathcal{O}(1)$	$\epsilon^{-3}\mathcal{O}(1)$

'regularities', should they be correct or trustworthy, must come from the 'order' or 'symmetry' contents of the underlying theory.

Let us elaborate. It is natural to expect that the contact couplings of EFT($\not\pi$) should be proportional to $\frac{4\pi}{M} m_\pi^{-n}$, thus such constraints must reflect the structures of the pion exchanges expanded in terms of momenta against pion mass, hence the structures of broken chiral symmetry intrinsic of chiral perturbation theory or QCD as the underlying theory. As a matter of fact, this situation could be generalized as below: Each coupling in an EFT is a simplified projected version of the amplitude computable in the underlying theory. These amplitudes must be constrained with fundamental 'symmetries', thus 'correlated' with each other. Translated into the EFT language, then, we end up with the EFT scenario parameters fit in certain fine-tuning patterns that are reminiscent of the correlations of the underlying theory amplitudes. Thus, EFT and the associated fine-tunings (sound ones, of course) are nothing else but a coarse or simplified realization or reflection of the delicate and yet regular 'structures' in the underlying theory. Not knowing the details of the underlying theory, we have to constrain the scenario parameters with empirical data or other physical inputs, thus the fine-tuning in the EFT approach to nuclear forces is in fact an indispensable step in the course of imposing boundary conditions. In particular, in the scenario C considered here, fine-tuning is a 'fine' 'component' of EFT calculations, naturally driven and soundly supported by empirical data.

V. DISCUSSIONS AND SUMMARY

In the foregoing analysis, we have worked with the uniform prescription for $[J_{2k+1}]$. One might wonder what would happen if alternative prescriptions are adopted. As these parameters should not be characterized by scales larger than Q or μ, then possible choices could only be characterized by smaller $[J_{2k+1}]$, such as $\tilde{j}_{2k+1} \sim \epsilon^{k+1}$ or even $\tilde{j}_{2k+1} = 0$. With such variants, one could find that the above conclusions for scenarios A, B and C essentially remain intact. For scenarios B and C, we summarize the ERE form factors calculated in the variant prescriptions for $[J_{2k+1}]$ in tables VI and VII respectively, where one could find that the three versions of scenario B and C essentially yield the same ERE form factors. Closer studies would tell us that all properties presented above remain valid across the three versions of scenario B and C. In particular, the leading order expression of $v_2(^3S_1)$ in the three versions of scenario C is identically the same, hence the same fine-tuning works in the three versions of scenario C that could reduce the size of this ERE form factor from $\mathcal{O}(1)$ down to $o(\epsilon^3)$.

The results given in table VII reveal that the PDS like prescription ($\tilde{j}_{\dots} = 0$) essentially produces the same effects for ERE as the usual one ($\tilde{j}_{\dots} = 1$) does, provided J_0 is separately determined as a physical scale. That means, in the PDS like prescription of $[\tilde{j}_{\dots}]$, conventional EFT couplings are compatible with large S-waves scattering lengths in the closed-form T matrices provided J_0 is properly sized. This reminds us again that J_0 is a fundamental parameter in the EFT description of NN scattering. As this parameter arises from the rescattering diagram, thus it must be a crucial parameter associated with rescattering. At this point, we refrain ourselves from attempting at further interpretation of this parameter in terms of nuclear physics before more phenomenologically oriented investigations are performed, especially when pion exchanges are present.

Below, we wish to make some attempts at understanding the various approaches proposed and/or adopted

TABLE VII: ERE in variants of scenario C: $\tilde{c}_{0;ss} \sim -1 - o(\epsilon)$

Variant	$\tilde{j}_{2k+1} = 1$	$\tilde{j}_{2k+1} = 0$	$\tilde{j}_{2k+1} = \epsilon^{3k+2}$
$S : \Lambda \cdot a$	$\epsilon^{-1}\mathcal{O}(1)$	$\epsilon^{-1}\mathcal{O}(1)$	$\epsilon^{-1}\mathcal{O}(1)$
$\Lambda \cdot r_e$	$2\tilde{c}_{2;ss}\mathcal{O}(1)$	$2\tilde{c}_{2;ss}\mathcal{O}(1)$	$2\tilde{c}_{2;ss}\mathcal{O}(1)$
$\Lambda^3 \cdot v_2$	$\mathcal{O}(1)$	$\mathcal{O}(1)$	$\mathcal{O}(1)$
$\Lambda^5 \cdot v_3$	$\mathcal{O}(1)$	$\mathcal{O}(1)$	$\mathcal{O}(1)$
$\Lambda^7 \cdot v_4$	$\mathcal{O}(1)$	$\mathcal{O}(1)$	$\mathcal{O}(1)$
$D : \Lambda^5 \cdot a$	$\epsilon^{-1}\mathcal{O}(1)$	$\epsilon^{-1}\mathcal{O}(1)$	$\epsilon^{-1}\mathcal{O}(1)$
$\Lambda^{-3} \cdot r_e$	$2\epsilon^{-1}\mathcal{O}(1)$	$2\epsilon^{-1}\mathcal{O}(1)$	$2\epsilon^{-1}\mathcal{O}(1)$
$\Lambda^{-1} \cdot v_2$	$\epsilon^{-2}\mathcal{O}(1)$	$\epsilon^{-2}\mathcal{O}(1)$	$\epsilon^{-2}\mathcal{O}(1)$

in literature in the light of EFT scenario discussed so far. Roughly speaking, a vast number of papers employed a finite cut-off of various sorts to remove the divergences. According to our foregoing discussions, the rationality of such treatments as field theoretical framework could be assessed in the light of EFT scenario: The finite cut-offs essentially play the roles of the complementary parameters, whose presences implement the loop-level subtraction or introduce the 'endogenous' counterterms effectively. In other words, as noted in Sect. III E, the EFT description usually breaks down at a finite value of the running scale, thus there is essentially no point to include the intermediate modes at scales much higher than the upper scale of EFT[50, 59]. Otherwise, such treatments could not be seen as genuine field theoretical ones due to the modeling 'elements' built-in with a finite cut-off that carries no physical essence in EFT perspective.

On other hand, there is also a vast number of perturbation like treatments in literature that could also be understood in terms of EFT scenario (see, e.g., Refs.[40, 49, 57, 58]) as the complementary parameters are also introduced or incorporated there in various disguises. Typically, they are either introduced as separation scales and/or 'allocated' somehow in the additionally introduced couplings that are promoted according to certain modification of EFT power counting. As such parameters could not be simply absorbed into conventional couplings or taken as ordinary running parameters, the scales involved in these parameters are practically fitted to some values near the upper scale of EFT or appropriate empirical data.

In a sense, the two main choices mentioned above seem to converge somehow to the EFT scenario structure explicated in this report: the conventional EFT description in terms of power counting only is augmented by complementary parameters in various forms, e.g., finite separation (or cut-off) scales fitted somehow and/or additional couplings that are promoted according to modified EFT power counting. Roughly speaking, keeping the regularization-related scales finite is just an alternative way of incorporating the complementary parameters into EFT description, hence an indirect realization of nonperturbative scenario of EFT renormalization. Of course, one thing that is common in all these literature is that the 'leading' components must be treated nonperturbatively. Moreover, fine-tuning is also at work to various extent in all these literature.

Similarly, the approaches adopted in Refs.[30, 51–53] could also be interpreted as incorporating the notions such as loop-level subtraction and complementary parameters that could not be readily identified as or absorbed into conventional couplings. Of course, the scenario structures beyond conventional couplings might also be realized by incorporating unconventional degrees and the associated couplings[55, 56]. In the contexts beyond few-body systems, it was noted in Ref.[78] that the perturbative like treatments of pion-exchanges still has some problems to fix, while the other main choice seems more efficient[7–9, 79].

In summary, the closed-form T matrices for NN scattering in the coupled channels ${}^3S_1$–${}^3D_1$ were presented in a general parametrization of divergent integrals within the realm of EFT($\not\pi$). The tight constraints imposed by these closed-form T matrices led us to the nonperturbative scenario of EFT renormalization: There are intrinsic mismatches between the EFT couplings and divergent integrals that can be factorized into finitely many nonperturbative divergences to be treated, then subtractions must be performed at loop-level through whatever means which give rise to some complementary parameters that are constrained to be physical or RG invariant. In addition, the couplings develop nonperturbative running behaviors. Then several typical scenarios were examined and analyzed using effective range expansion. It was shown that the scenarios with unconventional couplings suffer from some shortcomings and also seem to be disfavored by PSA data, while a simple scenario with conventional couplings is indeed compatible with realistic NN scattering behaviors after appreciating the pivotal role played by the RG invariant parameter J_0 and the fine-tuning of couplings. A heuristic understanding of most literature on NN scattering was also presented in terms of the fundamental contents of the nonperturbative scenario delineated here. We stress again that, our investigation has been performed in a general way that is applicable to any consistent EFT dominated by contact or short-distance interactions, not just valid in chiral effective theories of low-energy NN scattering. More phenomenological works such as descriptions of phase shifts and mixing angles using our closed-form T matrices for pionless EFT will be done in the near future[80]. The relations between the closed-form T matrices and 'perturbative' ones in KSW expansion will also be examined in future works[81].

Acknowledgement

The project is supported in part by the Kavli Institute of Theoretical Physics China and by the Ministry of Education of China. JFY is grateful to Bira Van Kolck, Yu-Qi Chen, Yu Jia, Fan Wang, Antonio Pineda, Hong-Ying Jin, Dao-Neng Gao and other participants at the KITPC program '*EFT's in Particle and Nuclear Physics*' for many helpful and enlightening conversations over the EFT topics.

Appendix A

Suppose $X_{AB}(A, B = 1, 2)$ are four $n \times n$ matrices, then the super matrix

$$\underline{X} \equiv \begin{pmatrix} X_{11} & X_{12} \\ X_{21} & X_{22} \end{pmatrix}$$

has a formal inverse of the following form,

$$\begin{aligned} \underline{X}^{-1} &= \begin{pmatrix} \left(\underline{X}^{-1}\right)_{11}, & \left(\underline{X}^{-1}\right)_{12} \\ \left(\underline{X}^{-1}\right)_{21}, & \left(\underline{X}^{-1}\right)_{22} \end{pmatrix}, \\ \left(\underline{X}^{-1}\right)_{11} &\equiv X_{11} - X_{12}X_{22}^{-1}X_{21})^{-1}, \\ \left(\underline{X}^{-1}\right)_{12} &\equiv (X_{21} - X_{22}X_{12}^{-1}X_{11})^{-1}, \\ \left(\underline{X}^{-1}\right)_{21} &\equiv (X_{12} - X_{11}X_{21}^{-1}X_{22})^{-1}, \\ \left(\underline{X}^{-1}\right)_{22} &\equiv (X_{22} - X_{21}X_{11}^{-1}X_{12})^{-1}. \end{aligned} \tag{119}$$

This is valid when each of the four blocks is non-singular matrix. When X_{AB} $(A \neq B)$ are singular, we have,

$$\begin{aligned} \left(\underline{X}^{-1}\right)_{12} &\equiv (X_{12}X_{22}^{-1}X_{21} - X_{11})^{-1}X_{12}X_{22}^{-1}, \\ \left(\underline{X}^{-1}\right)_{21} &\equiv X_{22}^{-1}X_{21}(X_{12}X_{22}^{-1}X_{21} - X_{11})^{-1}, \end{aligned} \tag{120}$$

or

$$\begin{aligned} \left(\underline{X}^{-1}\right)_{12} &\equiv X_{11}^{-1}X_{12}(X_{21}X_{11}^{-1}X_{12} - X_{22})^{-1}, \\ \left(\underline{X}^{-1}\right)_{21} &\equiv (X_{22} - X_{21}X_{11}^{-1}X_{12})^{-1}X_{21}X_{11}^{-1}. \end{aligned} \tag{121}$$

Furthermore, if three of the sub matrices are singular, then $\underline{X}^{-1}$ does not exist at all.

For $1 - \underline{\lambda \mathcal{I}}(E)$ in Sect. II, we have

$$(1 - \underline{\lambda \mathcal{I}}(E))^{-1} = \begin{pmatrix} \tilde{\mathcal{K}}_{ss}, & \tilde{\mathcal{K}}_{ss}\lambda_{sd}\mathcal{K}_{dd} \\ \tilde{\mathcal{K}}_{dd}\lambda_{ds}\mathcal{K}_{ss}, & \tilde{\mathcal{K}}_{dd} \end{pmatrix},$$

with

$$\mathcal{K}_{xx} \equiv (1 - \lambda_{xx}\mathcal{I})^{-1}, \ \tilde{\mathcal{K}}_{xx} \equiv (1 - \tilde{\lambda}_{xx}\mathcal{I})^{-1},$$

where $\tilde{\lambda}_{xx}$ is defined in Eq.(27,28) and $x = s, d$.

Appendix B

At order of $\Delta = 4$, we have

$$\Delta U_1 \equiv \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & p^2 \\ 1 & p^2 & p^4 \\ p^2 & p^4 & p^6 \end{pmatrix}, \ \Delta U_2 \equiv \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & p^2 \\ 1 & p^2 & p^4 \end{pmatrix}, \ \Delta U_3 \equiv \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & p^2 \end{pmatrix}, \ \Delta U_4 \equiv \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Appendix C

Introducing the following parametrization of $[\mathcal{N}..., \mathcal{D}...]$:

$$\mathcal{N}_0 \equiv \sum_{j=0}^{3} \nu_{0;j} p^{2j}, \ \mathcal{N}_1 \equiv \sum_{j=0}^{2} \nu_{1;j} p^{2j}, \ \mathcal{D}_0 \equiv \sum_{j=0}^{4} \delta_{0;j} p^{2j}, \ \mathcal{D}_1 \equiv \sum_{j=0}^{3} \delta_{1;j} p^{2j}, \ \mathcal{D}_{sd} \equiv \sum_{j=0}^{2} \delta_{sd;j} p^{2j}, \tag{122}$$

the concrete expressions of the coefficients $[\nu..., \delta...]$ read as follows,

$$\begin{aligned} \nu_{0;0} = \ & (1 - C_{2;ss}J_3 - C_{4;ss}J_5)^2 - (\tilde{C}_{4;ss} + C_{4;dd})(1 - C_{4;ss}J_5)^2 J_5 - C_{0;ss}\tilde{C}_{4;ss}J_3^2 + 2(1 - C_{4;ss}J_5) \\ & \times[(C_{2;ss}C_{4;dd} - C_{2;sd}\tilde{C}_{4;sd})J_5 - (C_{4;ss}\tilde{C}_{4;ss} + C_{4;sd}\tilde{C}_{4;sd})J_7]J_3 + [(2C_{2;ss}C_{2;sd}\tilde{C}_{4;sd} - C_{2;ss}^2 \\ & \times C_{4;dd} - C_{2;sd}^2\tilde{C}_{4;ss})J_5 + 2C_{4;sd}(C_{2;ss}\tilde{C}_{4;sd} - C_{2;sd}\tilde{C}_{4;ss})J_7 - \tilde{C}_{4;ss}(C_{4;ss}^2 + C_{4;sd}^2)J_9]J_3^2 \\ & +(\tilde{C}_{4;ss}C_{4;dd} - \tilde{C}_{4;sd}^2)\{(1 - C_{4;ss}J_5)^2 J_5^2 + C_{0;ss}J_3^2 J_5 + 2C_{4;ss}J_3J_5J_7(1 - C_{4;ss}J_5) \\ & +C_{4;sd}^2 J_3^2(J_5J_9 - J_7^2) + C_{4;ss}^2 J_3^2 J_5 J_9\}; \end{aligned} \tag{123}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \nu_{0;1} = \ & \{-\tilde{C}_{4;ss}(1 - C_{4;ss}J_5)^2 - C_{4;dd}(1 - C_{2;ss}J_3)^2 - 2(C_{4;ss} + C_{2;sd}\tilde{C}_{4;sd}J_3)(1 - C_{2;ss}J_3) + 2(C_{4;ss}^2 \\ & +2C_{4;ss}C_{4;dd} - C_{4;sd}\tilde{C}_{4;sd})J_5 - C_{2;sd}^2\tilde{C}_{4;ss}J_3^2 + 2[(C_{2;ss}\tilde{C}_{4;sd} - C_{2;sd}\tilde{C}_{4;ss})C_{4;sd} + 2(C_{2;sd} \\ & \times\tilde{C}_{4;sd} - C_{2;ss}C_{4;dd})C_{4;ss}]J_3J_5 - 3C_{4;dd}C_{4;ss}^2 J_5^2 + 2C_{4;ss}C_{4;sd}\tilde{C}_{4;sd}(J_5^2 + J_3J_7) + \tilde{C}_{4;ss}(C_{4;ss}^2 \\ & -C_{4;sd}^2)J_3J_7 + (\tilde{C}_{4;ss}C_{4;dd} - \tilde{C}_{4;sd}^2)[C_{0;ss}J_3^2 + 2(1 - C_{4;ss}J_5)^2 J_5 + 2C_{4;ss}J_3J_7 + C_{4;ss}^2 J_3(J_3 \\ & \times J_9 - 3J_5J_7) + C_{4;sd}^2(J_3J_9 - J_5J_7)J_3]\}J_3; \end{aligned} \tag{124}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \nu_{0;2} = \ & \{C_{4;ss}^2 + (C_{4;ss}C_{4;dd} - C_{4;sd}\tilde{C}_{4;sd})(2 - 2C_{2;ss}J_3 - 3C_{4;ss}J_5) + (C_{4;ss}\tilde{C}_{4;sd} - C_{4;sd}\tilde{C}_{4;ss}) \\ & \times(2C_{2;sd}J_3 + C_{4;sd}J_5) + (\tilde{C}_{4;ss}C_{4;dd} - \tilde{C}_{4;sd}^2)[(1 - C_{4;ss}J_5)^2 - (C_{4;ss}^2 + C_{4;sd}^2)J_3J_7]\}J_3^2; \end{aligned} \tag{125}$$

$$\nu_{0;3} = \ (2C_{4;ss}C_{4;sd}\tilde{C}_{4;sd} - C_{4;ss}^2 C_{4;dd} - \tilde{C}_{4;ss}C_{4;sd}^2)J_3^3; \tag{126}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \nu_{1;0} = \ & C_{4;dd}(1 - C_{2;ss}J_3 - C_{4;ss}J_5)^2 + 2C_{2;sd}\tilde{C}_{4;sd}(1 - C_{4;ss}J_5)J_3 - (2C_{2;ss}C_{2;sd}\tilde{C}_{4;sd} - C_{2;sd}^2 \\ & \times\tilde{C}_{4;ss})J_3^2 + (\tilde{C}_{4;sd}^2 - C_{4;dd}\tilde{C}_{4;ss})[C_{0;ss}J_3^2 + (1 - C_{4;ss}J_5)^2 J_5 + 2C_{4;ss}(1 - C_{4;ss}J_5)J_3J_7 \\ & +(C_{4;ss}^2 + C_{4;sd}^2)J_3^2 J_9]; \end{aligned} \tag{127}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \nu_{1;1} = \ & \{2(C_{4;sd}\tilde{C}_{4;sd} - C_{4;ss}C_{4;dd})(1 - C_{2;ss}J_3 - C_{4;ss}J_5) + 2C_{2;sd}(C_{4;sd}\tilde{C}_{4;ss} - C_{4;ss}\tilde{C}_{4;sd})J_3 \\ & +(\tilde{C}_{4;sd}^2 - C_{4;dd}\tilde{C}_{4;ss})[(1 - J_5C_{4;ss})^2 + (C_{4;ss}^2 + C_{4;sd}^2)J_3J_7]\}J_3; \end{aligned} \tag{128}$$

$$\nu_{1;2} = \ (C_{4;ss}^2 C_{4;dd} + \tilde{C}_{4;ss}C_{4;sd}^2 - 2C_{4;ss}C_{4;sd}\tilde{C}_{4;sd})J_3^2; \tag{129}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \delta_{0;0} = \ & [C_{0;ss} + (C_{4;ss}^2 + C_{4;sd}^2)J_9][1 - (\tilde{C}_{4;ss} + C_{4;dd})J_5] + (C_{2;ss}^2 + C_{2;sd}^2)J_5 + 2(C_{2;ss}C_{4;ss} \\ & +C_{2;sd}C_{4;sd})J_7 + (C_{2;sd}\tilde{C}_{4;sd} - C_{2;ss}C_{4;dd})(C_{2;ss}J_5^2 + 2C_{4;ss}J_5J_7) + (C_{2;ss}\tilde{C}_{4;sd} - C_{2;sd} \\ & \times\tilde{C}_{4;ss})(C_{2;sd}J_5^2 + 2C_{4;sd}J_5J_7) + (C_{4;ss}^2\tilde{C}_{4;ss} + 2C_{4;ss}C_{4;sd}\tilde{C}_{4;sd} + C_{4;sd}^2 C_{4;dd})J_7^2 + (\tilde{C}_{4;ss} \\ & \times C_{4;dd} - \tilde{C}_{4;sd}^2)[C_{0;ss}J_5^2 + (C_{4;ss}^2 + C_{4,sd}^2)(J_5^2 J_9 - J_5 J_7^2)]; \end{aligned} \tag{130}$$

$$\begin{aligned}\delta_{0;1} = \;& 2C_{2;ss} + (C^2_{2;sd} - C^2_{2;ss})J_3 + (\tilde{C}_{4;ss} - C_{4;dd})[C_{0;ss}J_3 + (C^2_{4;ss} + C^2_{4;sd})J_3J_9 - C^2_{4;sd}J_5J_7] \\ & +2C_{2;sd}C_{4;sd}J_5 + 2(C_{2;sd}\tilde{C}_{4;sd} - C_{2;ss}C_{4;dd})[J_5 + C_{4;ss}J_3J_7] + (C^2_{4;ss} + C^2_{4;sd} + 2C_{4;ss}\tilde{C}_{4;ss} \\ & +2C_{4;sd}\tilde{C}_{4;sd})J_7 + 2(C_{2;ss}\tilde{C}_{4;sd} - C_{2;sd}\tilde{C}_{4;ss})C_{4;sd}(J^2_5 - J_3J_7) + [2C_{4;ss}C_{4;sd}\tilde{C}_{4;sd} - C^2_{4;ss} \\ & \times(\tilde{C}_{4;ss} + C_{4;dd})]J_5J_7 + (\tilde{C}^2_{4;sd} - \tilde{C}_{4;ss}C_{4;dd})[2C_{4;ss}J_5 + (C^2_{4;ss} - C^2_{4;sd})(J_3J_7 - J^2_5)]J_7;\end{aligned} \tag{131}$$

$$\begin{aligned}\delta_{0;2} = \;& 2C_{4;ss} + \tilde{C}_{4;ss} + (C_{4;ss} + C_{4;dd})[(1 - C_{4;ss}J_5)^2 - 1 - 2C_{2;ss}J_3 + (C^2_{4;sd} - C^2_{4;ss})J_3J_7] \\ & +2(C_{4;sd} + \tilde{C}_{4;sd})C_{2;sd}J_3 + [C^2_{4;sd} - C^2_{4;ss} + 2C_{4;sd}\tilde{C}_{4;sd})]J_5 + C_{2;sd}(C_{2;sd}\tilde{C}_{4;ss} - C_{2;ss}\tilde{C}_{4;sd}) \\ & \times J^2_3 + (C_{2;ss}C_{4;dd} - C_{2;sd}\tilde{C}_{4;sd})(C_{2;ss}J^2_3 + 2C_{4;ss}J_3J_5) - C^2_{4;sd}\tilde{C}_{4;ss}J^2_5 + (\tilde{C}^2_{4;sd} - \tilde{C}_{4;ss}C_{4;dd}) \\ & \times\{(1 - C_{4;ss}J_5)^2J_5 + 2(1 - C_{4;ss}J_5)C_{4;ss}J_3J_7 + [C_{0;ss} + (C^2_{4;ss} + C^2_{4;sd})J_9]J^2_3\};\end{aligned} \tag{132}$$

$$\begin{aligned}\delta_{0;3} = \;& \{C^2_{4;sd} - C^2_{4;ss} + 2(C_{4;ss}C_{4;dd} + C_{4;sd}\tilde{C}_{4;sd}) + 2(C_{4;ss}C_{4;dd} - C_{4;sd}\tilde{C}_{4;sd})(C_{2;ss}J_3 + C_{4;ss}J_5) \\ & +2(C_{4;sd}\tilde{C}_{4;ss} - C_{4;ss}\tilde{C}_{4;sd})C_{2;sd}J_3 - (\tilde{C}_{4;ss}C_{4;dd} - \tilde{C}^2_{4;sd})[(1 - C_{4;ss}J_5)^2 - (C^2_{4;ss} + C^2_{4;sd}) \\ & \times J_3J_7]\}J_3;\end{aligned} \tag{133}$$

$$\delta_{0;4} = (C^2_{4;ss}C_{4;dd} + \tilde{C}_{4;ss}C^2_{4;sd} - 2C_{4;ss}C_{4;sd}\tilde{C}_{4;sd})J^2_3; \tag{134}$$

$$\begin{aligned}\delta_{1;0} = \;& [C_{0;ss} + (C^2_{4;ss} + C^2_{4;sd})J_9]C_{4;dd} - C^2_{2;sd} + [C^2_{2;ss}C_{4;dd} + C^2_{2;sd}\tilde{C}_{4;ss} - 2C_{2;ss}C_{2;sd}\tilde{C}_{4;sd}]J_5 \\ & +2(C_{2;ss}C_{4;dd} - C_{2;sd}\tilde{C}_{4;sd})C_{4;ss}J_7 + (\tilde{C}_{4;ss}C_{4;dd} - \tilde{C}^2_{4;sd})[C^2_{4;ss}J^2_7 - C_{0;ss}J_5 - (C^2_{4;ss} \\ & +C^2_{4;sd})J_5J_9];\end{aligned} \tag{135}$$

$$\begin{aligned}\delta_{1;1} = \;& 2[C_{2;ss}C_{4;dd} - C_{2;sd}(C_{4;sd} + \tilde{C}_{4;sd})] + (\tilde{C}_{4;ss}C_{4;dd} - \tilde{C}^2_{4;sd})[C_{0;ss}J_3 + 2C_{4;ss}J_7 + (C^2_{4;ss} \\ & +C^2_{4;sd})J_3J_9 + (C^2_{4;sd} - C^2_{4;ss})J_5J_7] + (C_{2;sd}\tilde{C}_{4;sd} - C_{2;ss}C_{4;dd})C_{2;ss}J_3 + (C_{2;sd}\tilde{C}_{4;ss} \\ & -C_{2;ss}\tilde{C}_{4;sd})(2C_{4;sd}J_5 - C_{2;sd}J_3) + [(C^2_{4;ss} - C^2_{4;sd})C_{4;dd} - 2C_{4;ss}C_{4;sd}\tilde{C}_{4;sd}]J_7;\end{aligned} \tag{136}$$

$$\begin{aligned}\delta_{1;2} = \;& (\tilde{C}_{4;ss}C_{4;dd} - \tilde{C}^2_{4;sd})[(1 - C_{4;ss}J_5)^2 - (C^2_{4;ss} + C^2_{4;sd})J_3J_7] + 2(C_{4;ss}C_{4;dd} - C_{4;sd}\tilde{C}_{4;sd}) \\ & \times(1 - C_{2;ss}J_3) - C^2_{4;sd} + 2(C_{4;ss}\tilde{C}_{4;sd} - C_{4;sd}\tilde{C}_{4;ss})C_{2;sd}J_3 + (\tilde{C}_{4;ss}C^2_{4;sd} - C^2_{4;ss} \\ & \times C_{4;dd})J_5;\end{aligned} \tag{137}$$

$$\delta_{1;3} = -(C^2_{4;ss}C_{4;dd} + \tilde{C}_{4;ss}C^2_{4;sd} - 2C_{4;ss}C_{4;sd}\tilde{C}_{4;sd})J_3; \tag{138}$$

$$\begin{aligned}\delta_{sd;0} = \;& C_{2;sd}(1 - C_{2;ss}J_3 - C_{4;ss}J_5) + [C_{0;ss} + (C^2_{4;ss} + C^2_{4;sd})J_9]\tilde{C}_{4;sd}J_3 + (C_{4;ss}\tilde{C}_{4;sd} + C_{4;sd}C_{4;dd}) \\ & \times(1 - C_{4;ss}J_5)J_7 + (C_{2;sd}\tilde{C}_{4;sd} - C_{2;ss}C_{4;dd})C_{4;sd}J_3J_7 + [C_{2;ss}\tilde{C}_{4;sd} - C_{2;sd}\tilde{C}_{4;ss} + (\tilde{C}^2_{4;sd} \\ & -C_{4;dd}\tilde{C}_{4;ss})C_{4;sd}J_7][(1 - C_{4;ss}J_5)J_5 + C_{4;ss}J_3J_7];\end{aligned} \tag{139}$$

$$\begin{aligned}\delta_{sd;1} = \;& C_{4;sd} + \tilde{C}_{4;sd} - [C_{2;ss}C_{4;sd} + C_{2;sd}C_{4;ss} + (\tilde{C}_{4;sd} + C_{4;dd})C_{4;ss}C_{4;sd}J_7]J_3 - [C_{4;ss}C_{4;sd} \\ & +\tilde{C}_{4;ss}C_{4;sd}(1 - C_{4;ss}J_5) + C_{4;ss}\tilde{C}_{4;sd}]J_5;\end{aligned} \tag{140}$$

$$\delta_{sd;2} = -C_{4;ss}C_{4;sd}J_3; \tag{141}$$

and

$$\nu_{0;3} + \nu_{1;2}J_3 = 0,\ \delta_{0;4} + \delta_{1;3}J_3 = 0,\ \delta_{0;4} = \nu_{1;2}. \tag{142}$$

Appendix D

In this appendix, we present the rigorous proof of the $\mathcal{I}_0$-independence of the fractional parts of $\mathbf{T^{-1}}$ in ${}^3S_1$–${}^3D_1$. To this end, we need to prove the unitarity of $\mathbf{T}$ first.

Using the super matrix notations introduced in Sect. II B, the algebraic LSE's read,

$$\underline{\tau} = \underline{\lambda} + \underline{\lambda\mathcal{I}\tau}. \tag{143}$$

Due to the EFT truncation, the enlarged matrix $\underline{\lambda}$ and hence $\underline{\tau}$ are singular, their inverse do not exist. Thus, we need to prove the following unitarity relation in terms of $\underline{\tau}$

$$\underline{\tau}^\dagger - \underline{\tau} \;=\; \underline{\tau}\left[\underline{\mathcal{I}}^\dagger - \underline{\mathcal{I}}\right]\underline{\tau}^\dagger = i\frac{Mp}{2\pi}\left[\underline{\tau}\begin{pmatrix} UU^T & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & UU^T \end{pmatrix}\underline{\tau}^\dagger\right], \tag{144}$$

or more specifically,

$$\begin{pmatrix} \tau_{ss} & \tau_{sd} \\ \tau_{ds} & \tau_{dd} \end{pmatrix}^\dagger - \begin{pmatrix} \tau_{ss} & \tau_{sd} \\ \tau_{ds} & \tau_{dd} \end{pmatrix} = i\frac{Mp}{2\pi} \begin{pmatrix} \tau_{ss} & \tau_{sd} \\ \tau_{ds} & \tau_{dd} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} UU^T & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & UU^T \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \tau_{ss} & \tau_{sd} \\ \tau_{ds} & \tau_{dd} \end{pmatrix}^\dagger . \tag{145}$$

We start with the Eq.(143), and its hermitian conjugate,

$$\underline{\tau}^\dagger = \underline{\lambda} + \underline{\tau}^\dagger \underline{\mathcal{I}}^\dagger \underline{\lambda}, \tag{146}$$

where the transpose symmetry of $\underline{\lambda}$ has been used. Now, multiplying Eq.(143) from the right by $\underline{\mathcal{I}\tau}^\dagger$ and multiplying Eq.(146) from the left by $\underline{\tau\mathcal{I}}^\dagger$, we could find that,

$$\underline{\tau\mathcal{I}\tau}^\dagger = \underline{\lambda\mathcal{I}\tau}^\dagger + \underline{\lambda\mathcal{I}\tau\mathcal{I}\tau}^\dagger \Rightarrow \underline{\tau\mathcal{I}\tau}^\dagger = -\underline{\tau}^\dagger + \left(1 - \underline{\lambda\mathcal{I}}\right)^{-1} \underline{\tau}^\dagger, \tag{147}$$

$$\underline{\tau\mathcal{I}\tau}^\dagger = \underline{\tau\mathcal{I}\lambda} + \underline{\tau\mathcal{I}\tau}^\dagger \underline{\mathcal{I}}^\dagger \underline{\lambda} \Rightarrow \underline{\tau\mathcal{I}}^\dagger \underline{\tau}^\dagger = -\underline{\tau} + \underline{\tau}(1 - \underline{\mathcal{I}}^\dagger \underline{\lambda})^{-1}. \tag{148}$$

Noting that

$$\left(1 - \underline{\lambda\mathcal{I}}\right)^{-1} \underline{\tau}^\dagger \quad = \left(1 - \underline{\lambda\mathcal{I}}\right)^{-1} \lambda (1 - \underline{\mathcal{I}}^\dagger \underline{\lambda})^{-1} = \underline{\tau}(1 - \underline{\mathcal{I}}^\dagger \underline{\lambda})^{-1}, \tag{149}$$

we finally have

$$\underline{\tau}(\underline{\mathcal{I}}^\dagger - \underline{\mathcal{I}})\underline{\tau}^\dagger = \underline{\tau}^\dagger - \underline{\tau}. \tag{150}$$

In similar fashion, we could also prove that

$$\underline{\tau}^\dagger(\underline{\mathcal{I}}^\dagger - \underline{\mathcal{I}})\underline{\tau} = \underline{\tau}^\dagger - \underline{\tau}. \tag{151}$$

This ends the proof for the unitarity in terms of $\underline{\tau}$. We have also verified this relation using the solutions of $\tau_{...}$ in terms of $\lambda_{...}$ given in Eqs. (23,24,25,26).

Now sandwiching the unitarity between

$$\begin{pmatrix} U & 0 \\ 0 & U \end{pmatrix}^T \text{ and } \begin{pmatrix} U & 0 \\ 0 & U \end{pmatrix},$$

we find

$$\begin{aligned} &\begin{pmatrix} U^T\tau_{ss}U & U^T\tau_{sd}U \\ U^T\tau_{ds}U & U^T\tau_{dd}U \end{pmatrix}^\dagger - \begin{pmatrix} U^T\tau_{ss}U & U^T\tau_{sd}U \\ U^T\tau_{ds}U & U^T\tau_{dd}U \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} T_{ss} & T_{sd} \\ T_{ds} & T_{dd} \end{pmatrix}^\dagger - \begin{pmatrix} T_{ss} & T_{sd} \\ T_{ds} & T_{dd} \end{pmatrix} = \mathbf{T}^\dagger - \mathbf{T} \\ &= i\frac{Mp}{2\pi} \begin{pmatrix} U^T\tau_{ss} & U^T\tau_{sd} \\ U^T\tau_{ds} & U^T\tau_{dd} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} UU^T & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & UU^T \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} U^T\tau_{ss} & U^T\tau_{sd} \\ U^T\tau_{ds} & U^T\tau_{dd} \end{pmatrix}^\dagger \\ &= i\frac{Mp}{2\pi} \begin{pmatrix} U^T\tau_{ss}U & U^T\tau_{sd}U \\ U^T\tau_{ds}U & U^T\tau_{dd}U \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} U^T\tau_{ss}U & U^T\tau_{sd}U \\ U^T\tau_{ds}U & U^T\tau_{dd}U \end{pmatrix}^\dagger = i\frac{Mp}{2\pi}\mathbf{T}\mathbf{T}^\dagger. \end{aligned} \tag{152}$$

Then inverting $\mathbf{T}$ again, we arrive at

$$\mathbf{T}^{-1} - (\mathbf{T}^\dagger)^{-1} = i\frac{Mp}{2\pi}\mathbf{I}. \tag{153}$$

These are the unitarity relation in terms of T matrices. Since J_0 always go with $i\frac{Mp}{4\pi}$, we conclude

$$\mathbf{T}^{-1} = \mathcal{I}_0\mathbf{I} + \Delta\mathbf{R}, \tag{154}$$

with $\Delta\mathbf{R}$ being $\mathcal{I}_0$-independent. In fact, each element of $\Delta\mathbf{R}$ takes the form of $\frac{\widetilde{\mathcal{N}}}{\widetilde{\mathcal{D}}}$ with $\widetilde{\mathcal{N}}$ and $\widetilde{\mathcal{D}}$ being polynomials in terms of $[C...], [J_{2m+1}]$ and p^2. The arguments go as follows: It is easy to see that $\mathbf{T}$ is a matrix made of rational functions in terms of $[C...], [J_{2m+1}]$ and p^2, thus $\mathbf{T}^{-1}$ must also be such kind of matrix. As the only complex parameter $\mathcal{I}_0$ has been isolated, the rest must be a real rational matrix in terms of $[C...], [J_{2m+1}]$ and p^2. *Q.E.D.*

[1] S. Weinberg, Phys. Lett. **B251**, 288 (1990).
[2] S. Weinberg, Nucl. Phys. **B363**, 3 (1991).
[3] C. Ordóñez, L. Ray, U. van Kolck, Phys. Rev. Lett. **72**, 1982 (1994).
[4] C. Ordóñez, L. Ray, U. van Kolck, Phys. Rev. **C53**, 2086 (1996).
[5] S.R. Beane, *et al.*, arXiv: nulc-th/0008064.
[6] P.F. Bedaque, U. van Kolck, Ann. Rev. Nucl. Part. Sci. **52**, 339 (2002). [arXiv: nucl-th/0203055.]
[7] E. Epelbaum, Prog. Part. Nucl. Phys. **57**, 654 (2006).
[8] E. Epelbaum, H.-W. Hammer, Ulf-G. Meißner, Rev. Mod. Phys. **81**, 1773 (2009).
[9] R. Machleidt, D.R. Entem, Phys. Rep. **503**, 1 (2011).
[10] D.B. Kaplan, M.J. Savage and M.B. Wise, Phys. Lett. **B424**, 390 (1998).
[11] D.B. Kaplan, M.J. Savage and M.B. Wise, Nucl. Phys. **B534**, 329 (1998).
[12] U. van Kolck, Nucl. Phys. **A645**, 273 (1999).
[13] S.R. Beane and T.D. Cohen, D.R. Phillips, Nucl. Phys. **A632**, 445 (1998).
[14] D.R. Phillips, S.R. Beane and T.D. Cohen, Ann. Phys. (NY) **263**, 255 (1998).
[15] T.D. Cohen, J.M. Hansen, Phys. Lett. **B440**, 233 (1998).
[16] T.D. Cohen, J.M. Hansen, Phys. Rev. **C59**, 13, 3047 (1999).
[17] J. Gegelia, Phys. Lett. **B429**, 277 (1998) [nucl-th/9802038].
[18] J. Gegelia, arXiv: nucl-th/9806028.
[19] J. Gegelia, J. Phys. **G25**,1681 (1999).
[20] T.S. Park, K. Kubodera, D.P. Min, M. Rho, Phys. Rev. **C58**, 637 (1998).
[21] J.V. Steele, R.J. Furnstahl, Nucl. Phys. **A637**, 46 (1998).
[22] J.V. Steele, R.J. Furnstahl, Nucl. Phys. **A645**, 439 (1999).
[23] E. Epelbaum, W. Glöckle, Ulf-G. Meißner, Nucl. Phys. **A637**, 108 (1998).
[24] E. Epelbaum, W. Glöckle, Ulf-G. Meißner, Nucl. Phys. **A671**, 295 (2000).
[25] E. Epelbaum, W. Glöckle, Ulf-G. Meißner, Nucl. Phys. **A747**, 362 (2005).
[26] T. Mehen, I.W. Stewart, Phys. Lett. **B445**, 378 (1999).
[27] T. Mehen, I.W. Stewart, Phys. Rev. **C59**, 2365 (1999).
[28] M.C. Birse, J.A. McGovern, K.G. Richardson, Phys. Lett. **B464**, 169 (1999).
[29] T. Barford, M.C. Birse, Phys. Rev. **C67**, 064006 (2003).
[30] T. Frederico, V.S. Timóteo and L. Tomio, Nucl. Phys. **A653**, 209 (1999).
[31] J.-W Chen, G. Rupak, M.J. Savage, Nucl. Phys. **A653**, 386 (1999).
[32] S. Fleming, T. Mehen, I.W. Stewart, Nucl. Phys. **A677**, 313 (2000).
[33] S. Fleming, T. Mehen, I.W. Stewart, Phys. Rev. **C61**, 044005 (2000).
[34] D.R. Entem, R. Machleidt, Phys. Lett. **B524**, 93 (2001).
[35] D.R. Entem, R. Machleidt, Phys. Rev. **C66**, 014002 (2002).
[36] D.R. Entem, R. Machleidt, Phys. Rev. **C68**, 041001 (2003).
[37] S.K. Bogner, T.T.S. Kuo, L. Coraggio, Nucl. Phys. **A684**, 432c (2001).
[38] S.K. Bogner *et al*, Phys. Lett. **B576**, 265 (2003).
[39] J.D. Holt, T.T.S. Kuo, G.E. Brown, S.K. Bogner, Nucl. Phys. **A733**, 153 (2004).
[40] S.R. Beane, P.F. Bedaque, M.J. Savage, U. van Kolck, Nucl. Phys. **A700**, 377 (2002).
[41] D. Eiras, J. Soto, Eur. Phys. J. **A17**, 89 (2003) [nucl-th/0107009].
[42] M.P. Valderrama, E.R. Arriola, Phys. Lett. **B580**, 149 (2004).
[43] M.P. Valderrama, E.R. Arriola, Phys. Rev. **C72**, 044007 (2005).
[44] M.P. Valderrama, E.R. Arriola, Phys. Rev. **C74**, 054001, 064004 (2006).
[45] R. Higa, M.P. Valderrama, E.R. Arriola, Phys. Rev. **C77**, 034003 (2008).
[46] J.-F. Yang, arXiv: nucl-th/0310048(0407090).
[47] J.-F. Yang, J.-H. Huang, Phys. Rev. **C71**, 034001, 069901(E) (2005) [arXiv: nucl-th/0409023v4].
[48] R. Higa, arXiv: nucl-th/0411046.
[49] A. Nogga, R.G.E. Timmermans, U. van Kolck, Phys. Rev. **C72**, 054006 (2005).
[50] E. Epelbaum, Ulf-G. Meißner, arXiv: nucl-th/0609037.
[51] C.-J. Yang, C. Elster, D.R. Phillips, Phys. Rev. **C77**, 014002 (2008).
[52] C.-J. Yang, C. Elster, D.R. Phillips, Phys. Rev. **C80**, 034002 (2009).

[53] C.-J. Yang, C. Elster, D.R. Phillips, Phys. Rev. **C80**, 044002 (2009)
[54] J.-F. Yang, Europhys. Lett. **85**, 51003 (2009) [nucl-th/0711.4637].
[55] J. Soto, J. Tarrús, Phys. Rev. **C78**, 024003 (2008).
[56] J. Soto, J. Tarrús, Phys. Rev. **C81**, 014005 (2010).
[57] B. Long, U. van Kolck, Ann Phys. (N.Y.) **323**, 1304 (2008).
[58] S.R. Beane, D.B. Kaplan, A. Vuorinen, Phys. Rev. **C80**, 011001(R) (2009).
[59] E. Epelbaum, J. Gegelia, Eur. Phys. J. **A41**, 341 (2009).
[60] J.-F. Yang, arXiv: 0901.2766[nucl-th].
[61] J.-F. Yang, J. Phys. **A42**, 345402 (2009).
[62] K. Harada, H. Kubo, Y. Yamamoto, Phys. Rev. **C83**, 034002 (2011).
[63] J.-F. Yang, Europhys. Lett. **94**, 41002 (2011).
[64] M.P. Valderrama, Phys. Rev. **C83**, 024003 (2011).
[65] M.P. Valderrama, arXiv: 1108.0872[nucl-th].
[66] B. Long, C.-J. Yang, arXiv: 1108.0985[nucl-th].
[67] G.P. Lepage, arXiv: nucl-th/9706029.
[68] J. Mondejar, J. Soto, Eur. Phys. J. **A32**, 77 (2007).
[69] J.-F. Yang, arXiv: hep-th/9708104.
[70] J.-F. Yang, invited talk in: *Proceedings of the XIth International Conference 'Problems of Quantum Field Theory'*, Eds. B.M. Barbashov, G.V. Efimov, A.V. Efremov, (Publishing Department of JINR, Dubna, 1999), p.202[arXiv: hep-th/9901138].
[71] J.-F. Yang, arXiv: hep-th/9904055.
[72] J.-F. Yang, arXiv: hep-ph/0212208.
[73] E. Epelbaum, arXiv: 1001.3229[nucl-th].
[74] U. van Kolck, arXiv: 0812.3926[nucl-th].
[75] E. Epelbaum, W. Glöckle, Ulf-G. Meißner, Nucl. Phys. **A747**, 362 (2005).
[76] N. Kaiser, R. Brockmann, W. Weise, Nucl. Phys. **A625**, 758 (1997).
[77] E. Epelbaum, Doctoral thesis, published in: Berichte des Forschungszentrum Jülich, No. 3803 (2000).
[78] D.R. Entem, E.R. Arriola, M.P. Valderrama, R. Machleidt, Phys. Rev. **C77**, 044006 (2008).
[79] G.E. Brown, T.T.S. Kuo, J.W. Holt, S. Lee, *The Nucleon-Nucleon Intercation and the Nuclear Many-Body Problem*, (World Scientific, Singapore, 2010).
[80] P.-P. Wang, J.-F. Yang, in progress.
[81] J. Liu, J.-F. Yang, in progress.